

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

WEDNESDAY, April 29, 1998

New York Times

April 29, 1998

Pg. 1

Senators Reject Bid To Limit Costs Of Enlarging NATO

By Eric Schmitt

WASHINGTON -- The Senate on Tuesday overwhelmingly rejected a measure to limit the cost to American taxpayers of weapons to the three Eastern European countries nominated to join the NATO military alliance.

The vote, 76-24, was the first of as many as two dozen amendments the Senate may tack onto the resolution to add Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to the alliance.

At issue in the amendment, designed to cap U.S. costs, was whether the three nations can afford the armed forces required for NATO membership or will end up as wards of the wealthier 16 member nations.

The amendment, proposed by Sen. Tom Harkin, D-Iowa, would have restricted the amount of military subsidies the United States provides to the prospective members to 25 percent of total NATO aid to the countries. The aid would be in the form of grants, loan guarantees and surplus arms.

"Can they afford to bear the burden or not?" Harkin said.

"We've been told they can. Now I'm hearing, well, maybe they can't, we'll have to give them subsidies for weapons. If that's the case, do they have the economic strength to join NATO?"

But opponents of the measure said that Harkin was confusing two separate issues -- NATO expansion and foreign arms sales -- and that the amendment jeopardized Washington's ability to supply arms to allies in times of crisis.

"The United States has not signed up to foot the bill," said Sen. Gordon Smith, R-Ore. "The amendment attempts to strangle NATO expansion," he added, by placing "unreasonable restrictions on expenditures."

In the second day of lively debate this week, senators jostled on a range of issues, from NATO's future missions to a proposal that the three former Warsaw Pact nations now up for a key to the NATO club fully open their archives to help account for American servicemen missing from past wars or cold war incidents.

The Senate will vote on

these issues later in the week.

Expanding NATO requires the approval of two-thirds of the Senate, but amending the resolution needs only a simple majority. Senate critics of expansion, conceding that they face an uphill battle to defeat the resolution, say their strategy now is to win some amendments. A final vote is likely later this week.

Few issues have raised more concern among senators about enlarging the alliance than the cost.

The issue is confusing because cost estimates are all over the map, from \$1.5 billion to \$125 billion over a decade or more, depending on the assumptions. But the Pentagon insists that the best 10-year estimate now is \$1.5 billion, with Washington's share at \$400 million.

"There has been a lot of misinformation about the costs, some of it understandable," Defense Secretary William Cohen told reporters on Monday.

Harkin argued that the administration and other supporters of NATO expansion were

guilty of false advertising when they said enlargement would cost \$400 million over a decade.

That figure covers only "common costs" shared among all members, like maintaining NATO's headquarters buildings in Brussels and the alliance's fleet of AWACS radar planes. It does not cover the various subsidies that the U.S. government pays for when it sells or transfers weapons to foreign countries. A recent study by the World Policy Institute found that government subsidies represented \$7.8 billion of \$12 billion in American arms exports in 1996.

"We're told it's only going to cost \$400 million, but this could go up and up and up with subsidies," Harkin said.

Sen. Joseph Lieberman, D-Conn., whose state has several large military contractors, warned that the measure would "hurt American defense workers whose products will not be able to be sold in these three countries."

Harkin confronted Lieberman, saying: "This is a whole

Russia Planning to Ship Antiaircraft Missiles to Greek Cypriots

New York Times...See Pg. 2

Mustard Gas Found in Iraqi Shells, U.N. Inspector Says

New York Times...See Pg. 3

U.S. Weighing Cut in Military Forces Stationed in Gulf

Washington Post...See Pg. 4



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



new venue in this debate about jobs. I thought this was about democracy." Lieberman quickly retreated.

"No, the overall debate is not about American workers," Lieberman said. "It's about the principles of freedom."

Sen. Joseph Biden Jr., D-Del., and leading supporter of NATO expansion, said that competition for arms sales to fellow NATO members already existed and that the Harkin amendment would only hurt American companies.

"If you don't let Lockheed or Martin Marietta sell, with subsidies, to the Greeks or the Spaniards, you're just subsidizing the French," Biden said. "We'll lose our competitive advantage."

Moreover, Biden said, Harkin was confusing NATO expansion and foreign arms sales. "We are taking great big apples and putting them in a basket of small oranges," he said.

Sen. John Warner, R-Va., who opposes NATO enlargement, disagreed, saying there is

an unwritten commitment by NATO members to help newcomers get a leg up.

"While there is nothing fixed in law for increased contributions for these three potential new members, there is a moral obligation," Warner said.

The scant support for his amendment did not dissuade Harkin from broaching an even more controversial point: Why have NATO at all?

"If something is born because of the Soviet Union, what are the reasons not only for continuing it, but for expanding it?" Harkin asked. "There are other means to promote democracy and economic markets."

He continued: "I'm really worried we're buying into a mentality of the cold war, and not looking to the next century. We're not about to see any headlines that say Russian troops are marching toward Poland or the Czech Republic."

"Europe is powerful," Harkin said. "Europe is wealthy. There's no Soviet Union. There's no threat.

Europe has been rebuilt. Let's look ahead."

Throughout the afternoon, however, many senators marched to the floor to back the treaty's expansion.

"If NATO doesn't enlarge, the Iron Curtain remains permanent, and the unnatural division will live on longer than the Soviet empire did," said Sen. Barbara Mikulski, D-Md., adding that NATO would remain "an alumni club for cold war victors."

"As a Polish-American, I know that the Polish people did not choose to live behind the Iron Curtain," Senator Mikulski said. "These countries are not asking for a handout. They are not asking for our protection. They are asking to be full partners in the new Europe."

Sen. Chuck Hagel, R-Neb., who supports expansion, urged caution when examining the concern that NATO's eastward push would antagonize Russia, saying: "Here we are, almost 10 years after the fall of Communism, with the Berlin wall, talking about, 'Well, I don't know, should we do this? We

might offend our Russian friends."

Hagel continued: "I don't see an awful lot of sense in this. Yes, it is important to understand the Russians. Yes, it is important to engage the Russians. But we should not allow Russia, or any other nation, to dominate the final analysis and decisions of our nation's security interests."

On Wednesday and Thursday, senators will debate amendments to require membership in the European Union as a prerequisite for NATO candidacy and to wait at least three years before considering the next round of new members.

For some Senate opponents of expansion, however, admitting the three countries under review will inevitably lead to more, and to a weaker alliance.

"This is just the beginning to more and more countries," said Sen. James Inhofe, R-Okla. "After the first three recruits, I don't see where there's an end to it."

New York Times

April 29, 1998

Pg. 1

Russia Planning to Ship Antiaircraft Missiles to Greek Cypriots

By Michael R. Gordon

MOSCOW -- Russia plans to deliver advanced antiaircraft missiles to the Greek Cypriot government in August, despite American protests that the sale will inflame tensions on the island, part of which is Turkish-controlled.

The United States has repeatedly sought to block the sale of the S-300 system, as the missiles are known, and Turkey has even warned that it may take military action. But on Tuesday, the head of the Russian arms sales company Rosvooruzheniye, Yevgeny Ananyev, said Russia was determined to ship the weapons.

"The S-300 systems will be

delivered on schedule according to the contract," Ananyev said. "They will be shipped late in July. I believe that Cyprus will get them in the middle of August."

The disclosure of the sale comes at a particularly sensitive moment for Cyprus, which has been divided between ethnic Greeks and Turks since 1974. Richard Holbrooke, the U.S. special envoy for Cyprus, is to arrive there on Friday to try to restart negotiations between the two sides.

Cyprus was divided after the military junta that ruled Greece in the early 1970s encouraged a coup in Cyprus, and Turkey responded by occupying the northern third of the island.

Turkey has about 30,000 troops in the Turkish part, which has declared itself to be a sovereign state but whose independence is recognized only by Turkey.

Greek Cypriot officials have hinted that they may defer or cancel the purchase if serious negotiations get under way. But American officials say the sale is needlessly provocative and is complicating their diplomatic efforts.

The dominant view among American officials is that the sale is part of a disturbing pattern in which Moscow has used exports to prop up its ailing military industry with little regard for the foreign policy consequences.

Russia is getting about \$200

million for the missiles, but clearly hopes that publicity about the sale will stimulate interest among other customers.

Some American specialists, however, believe Russia also has other motivations: extending Moscow's influence to the region and creating problems for NATO by encouraging strains between Greece and Turkey, two members of the Western alliance.

Proponents of this view note that the Greek defense minister recently visited Moscow, where he was received by President Boris Yeltsin.

That Turkey is anxious about the deal is clear. Not only has Turkey rattled the saber, it

NOTICE TO READERS

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

has also stopped foreign ships from the Black Sea ports of Russia and Ukraine and inspected them to make sure they were not transporting the S-300 system to Cyprus.

Vladimir Rakhmanin, the head of the information department of the Russian Foreign Ministry, defended the sale. He asserted that the S-300 deal was not responsible for the longstanding tensions on Cyprus and added that Moscow had proposed the demilitarization of the island.

"The S-300 contract is a purely commercial deal," Rakhmanin said. "We believe it should go forward."

The S-300 is actually a complex of systems, consisting of missiles, launchers and several radars. The Greek Cypriots say the S-300 is a defensive weapon, which would enable them to defend against Turkish aircraft. But the S-300 would also have the ability to attack planes in Turkish air space.

Rosvooruzheniye, the Russian arms export agency, has already received a down payment for the sale. In a related development, the agency disclosed on Tuesday that Gen. Pavel Grachev, the former defense minister who was dismissed by Yeltsin in 1996, has been appointed chief military

adviser to the arms agency. His job will be to help promote arms sales.

Some American analysts say the Greek Cypriot decision to buy the S-300 had its origins in a confrontation between Greece and Turkey in 1996 over a tiny cluster of rocks in the Aegean Sea.

Greece withdrew its soldiers from the uninhabited 10-acre island, averting a clash. But to save face and defy the Turks the Greek Cypriots later signed a contract to buy the S-300 with the strong support of Athens, according to this view.

The S-300 purchase may

also have been a bargaining chip for the Greek Cypriots. But the talks over Cyprus have faltered, in part because of Turkey's resentment over the European Union's refusal to admit it as a member.

American officials insist the deployment of the S-300 would undermine the security of Cyprus. They say the weapon is effective enough to worry the Turks, but not effective enough to alter the basic military equation or prevent a Turkish invasion.

"We do not think buying the system makes a great deal of sense," an American official said.

New York Times

April 29, 1998

Mustard Gas Found In Iraqi Shells, U.N. Inspector Says

By Barbara Crossette

UNITED NATIONS -- The U.N.'s chief arms inspector for Iraq said Tuesday that experts discovered active mustard gas last month in artillery shells found at an Iraqi armaments depot in 1996, raising new questions about more than 500 to 700 similar shells that are still unaccounted for in Iraq.

The inspector, Richard Butler, said at a news conference Tuesday that this case, which he described to the Security Council on Monday, illustrated the recurrent problems encountered by his U.N. Special Commission since it was charged in 1991 with eliminating Iraq's prohibited weapons and the means to manufacture them.

Mustard gas is a chemical agent that blisters the skin and lungs, burns the eyes and can cause cancers in the mouth, throat and respiratory tract. Commission officials said Tuesday that they had long suspected that the 155-millimeter shells that Iraq was known to have and that remain unaccounted for were likely to have been filled with mustard gas, which is stored as a viscous liquid.

Earlier this month, a Russian chemical-weapons expert on the commission, Igor Mitrokhin, went to Iraq to try to learn more about the shells and hundreds of unaccounted-for canisters, bombs and rockets thought to have been designed

to deliver chemical and biological weapons.

Butler refused Tuesday to give details of Mitrokhin's findings, or of the ongoing investigation into the shells with the still-active gas. Another commission official said the shells had been sealed at an undisclosed location while a decision was being made about how to destroy them.

At least four of the 155-millimeter shells, with imported casings, were found in 1996 at an ammunition depot in central Iraq and were duly cataloged. The shells were not tested until March of this year, in the face of Iraqi opposition, after Iraq argued that they were no longer active and that more fieldwork in this area would be pointless.

On Tuesday, Iraq's foreign minister, Mohammed Said al-Sahaf, said again at a news conference here that Iraq destroyed all its prohibited weapons in 1991. Carrying on an endless search for banned arms while prolonging the sanctions against Iraq is an "unprecedented injustice to the Iraqi people," he said. He accused the Special Commission of propagating lies.

Barely an hour later, Butler gave his account.

"We went to a place where there was a mixed bag of munitions, and we found some that had mustard in them," he said. "Now this raised the question of how many other such shells there are, or rock-

ets, or bombs."

"This drives us back to their statement of disclosure, which itself has some discrepancies in it, which they themselves then changed," Butler said of the Iraqis' accounting of their munitions.

"One of their claims was that even if shells like this did exist, they would be useless because the weapons agent inside would be so old that it would have polymerized -- it would have hardened and been useless," he said. "That's why we drilled holes in a couple of them to see if that were true. And it turned out to be very untrue."

"We have discovered an amount of chemical munitions -- I can't tell you the exact amount because we have yet to bring it to account -- with perfectly good chemical warfare agent within them," he said. "We tested them, and the mustard was 97 percent pure."

Butler and the U.N. Special Commission, known as Unsc, have had a difficult few weeks here as Iraq -- with the help of Russia, China, France and a few U.N. officials -- has put more pressure on the inspectors to scale back their work than on the Iraqis to come clean about the missing pieces in their arms programs.

At a Security Council meeting on Monday, which began in mid-morning and did not end until after 8 p.m., Butler came under intense grilling,

diplomats said Tuesday. The Council, meeting behind closed doors, ultimately continued sanctions on Iraq, but not before calling Butler back for repeated questioning.

After formally submitting a report concluding that there had been virtually no progress in disarmament over the last six months, he was sharply cross-examined by the Russian representative, Sergei Lavrov, and accused by the Chinese deputy representative, Shen Guofang, of running an "insolent and arrogant" operation in Iraq that resembled "an army of occupation," according to observers in the room.

Butler said Tuesday that Iraq could not expect to have sanctions lifted by declaring itself free of weapons and then withholding full evidence to back its declarations.

"It's against the rules to believe it just because you say it," he said. "You have to give us the material to support your claim. That's where they are failing."

"On one hand, they say: We have nothing, we destroyed it all in 1991," he said. "But on the other hand, they have put documents before us -- their disclosure documents -- which concede the existence of weapons after 1991."

Sahaf, at his news conference Tuesday, was pressed to explain how Baghdad interpreted the agreement between President Saddam Hussein and

Secretary-General Kofi Annan that opened eight presidential properties to international inspection in March.

Sahhaf said that follow-up inspections -- he called them "visits" and said Iraq had never agreed to "inspections" of those

sites -- would have to be requested by Annan, not the Special Commission or the International Atomic Energy

Agency, as the agreement stated. He was vague about the number and timing of the return visits.

U.S. Weighing Cut In Military Forces Stationed in Gulf

Washington Post

April 29, 1998

Pg. 10

By Bradley Graham and John Harris
Washington Post
Staff Writers

Senior administration officials have begun considering whether to reduce U.S. military forces in the Persian Gulf, but remain undecided as they weigh conflicting concerns about keeping the pressure on Iraq while relieving the strain on Pentagon operations and budgets.

Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said yesterday that President Clinton was expected to make a decision on the size of the U.S. troop presence within "the next couple of weeks." Other officials reported that the subject had been taken up by the president's national security team at meetings last week and yesterday, with no resolution.

U.S. forces in the gulf have remained at peak levels of about 36,000 troops since February, when Iraq averted the threat of American air strikes and renewed a commitment to unrestricted access by United Nations weapons inspectors. Although Iraq has made good on its promise to let inspectors into presidential sites previously closed to them, U.N. authorities continue to fault Baghdad for failing to provide

sufficient information about its weapons production efforts.

The U.N. Security Council decided on Monday to leave sanctions in place against Iraq based on a report from U.N. arms inspectors that it still had not complied with resolutions following the 1991 Persian Gulf War that required the scrapping of all its nuclear, biological and chemical weapons programs. Under such circumstances, U.S. officials worry that a troop withdrawal now might be interpreted as a sign of flagging U.S. concern.

An administration official close to White House deliberations said senior policymaking officials are wary of shrinking the gulf force within the next several weeks. Clinton and senior national security aides want more time to gauge Iraqi President Saddam Hussein's reaction to the recently completed sanctions review.

"It's not a great time to do it," said this official.

But Bacon noted that the conditions in the gulf had become "somewhat less threatening than they were several months ago," when the United States rushed extra forces to the gulf in anticipation of a showdown over the weapons inspections.

"So the language is less bellicose, less threatening, and

[Saddam Hussein's] actions have been more receptive to U.N. Special Commission inspectors," Bacon said. "Those are two things that have changed."

The gulf buildup has stretched U.S. national security commitments elsewhere and confronted the Defense Department with extra costs, estimated at \$1.36 billion through September, when the fiscal year ends. The surge in forces has involved nearly 400 combat aircraft, 29 ships and roughly double the number of sailors, soldiers, Marines and airmen that the United States had been maintaining in the region. It has created gaps, most notably in the absence of aircraft carriers and other military assets in two critical foreign theaters -- the western Pacific and the Mediterranean Sea.

Defense officials said Gen. Anthony Zinni, the four-star Marine Corps officer who oversees U.S. forces in the gulf, briefed Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and the military service chiefs about two weeks ago on options for reducing the American military presence.

"The big piece is what to do about the carriers there -- whether to go from two to one," said a military source

familiar with the briefing. Zinni's options also included cuts in land-based aircraft and ground troops.

But even the most sizable reduction on Zinni's list, the source said, would leave a force in the gulf considerably greater than what existed before the rise in tensions with Iraq last autumn. And Bacon stressed yesterday that any cut in forces could be quickly reversed should Iraqi actions present a new threat.

The administration's discussions over force size have been part of a broader high-level review of Iraq strategy, officials said. The thrust of the conversations has been how to de-escalate the crisis and reduce expectations that any violation by Iraq of the inspections regime must be met by the threat of military force -- an approach not favored by most U.S. allies, especially in the Arab world.

The gradually emerging strategy would instead emphasize containment -- the threat of disproportionate force if Iraq uses weapons of mass destruction -- coupled with public warnings to Iraq that sanctions will never be lifted until it demonstrates sustained compliance with weapons inspectors, officials said.

Washington Post

April 29, 1998

Pg. 10

Iraq Wants to Set Limit On Weapons Inspections

Statement Contradicts U.N. Officials

By John M. Goshko
Washington Post
Staff Writer

UNITED NATIONS, April 28—Iraqi Foreign Minister Mohammed Saeed Sahhaf said today that an agreement negotiated by Secretary General Kofi Annan to permit weapons searches of previously off-limits presidential buildings

does not entitle inspectors to an unlimited number of visits over an indefinite period, apparently contradicting U.N. officials.

At a news conference here, Sahhaf said the Feb. 23 agreement, which averted U.S. air and missile strikes against Iraq, refers only to "an initial visit and subsequent visits." While he was vague about how many "subsequent visits" might be

allowed, he left no doubt that Baghdad does not intend to let them take place indefinitely and believes that it, and not the United Nations, has the power to decide when they should be ended.

Although Sahhaf insisted that Annan agrees with this interpretation, his remarks clearly contradicted statements by the secretary general and

other U.N. officials, who have said that the accord allows as many searches as the inspectors feel are necessary in pursuit of prohibited weapons. Sahhaf did not threaten to cut off access to the presidential compounds, but his words seemed to be a warning that the issue has not been resolved and could lead to new confrontations between the United Nations and the government of President Saddam Hussein.

The access question arose as Sahhaf characterized as "very disappointing" the Security

Council's decision Monday to continue the sanctions that have been in place against Iraq for almost eight years. Nevertheless, he said Iraq would continue to cooperate with the United Nations in hopes of eventually overcoming what he called "the campaign of lies, distortions and hypocrisy" waged against it by the United States and Britain since the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

The council has said it will not lift the sanctions until it is satisfied that Iraq has eliminated all its weapons of mass destruction. Sahhaf today repeated Iraq's claim that the proscribed weapons were destroyed in 1991. But that assertion was contradicted later by Richard Butler, executive

chairman of the U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM) charged with overseeing Iraqi disarmament.

Butler said his inspectors recently had found artillery shells filled with mustard gas in Iraq. Mustard gas, a deadly and crippling chemical agent, caused untold casualties in World War I and subsequently was outlawed by international conventions. He would not provide any details of the size or location of the find, or when the discovery was made.

"We have discovered an amount of chemical munitions with perfectly good chemical warfare agents within them," Butler said. "We tested a couple of them and the mustard was 97 percent pure."

Iraq's refusal to allow UN-

SCOM personnel to search the presidential compounds for evidence of chemical and biological weapons caused a standoff that was resolved when Annan went to Baghdad and negotiated an agreement for UNSCOM inspectors to enter these areas accompanied by diplomats.

In subsequent statements and assurances given to the United States, he said that the agreement in no way compromised UNSCOM's right of unlimited access to these premises. Initial inspections of all eight sites were carried out in late March and early April and did not reveal any evidence of prohibited activity or equipment.

Sahhaf asserted today that

these searches were "not an ordinary disarmament procedure" such as those conducted by UNSCOM elsewhere in Iraq, but "a special arrangement until the U.N. is completely assured that these American and British allegations are completely baseless... maybe there will be a subsequent visit. That's all. That's all."

Sahhaf disputed reporters' suggestions that his remarks contradicted Annan's statement that the accord provides for unlimited access. "The secretary general never said 'no limit' and never touched that point," Sahhaf insisted. Annan left today on a visit to Africa and was not available to comment.

USA Today

April 29, 1998

Pg. 11

Iraq caught between a rock and U.S.

By Barbara Slavin
USA TODAY

Saddam Hussein celebrated his 61st birthday Tuesday, but he didn't get the present he wanted most: freedom to spend Iraq's oil revenue.

To seal a leaky anti-Iraq coalition, the United States is prepared to toss Saddam a bone. The administration is considering a U.N. statement acknowledging progress in accounting for an Iraqi nuclear weapons program and possibly easing stringent inspections in October. A U.S. draft also

NEWS ANALYSIS

welcomes the "improved access" Iraq has provided to U.N. inspectors since Saddam, under threat of U.S. attack, met with U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan in February.

But the Clinton administration opposes easing a seven-year economic embargo. As long as Saddam remains in power, the U.S. plan is to hold Iraq in a virtual economic trusteeship, senior U.S. officials say.

Out of concern for Iraq's population of 22 million, the United States has approved a plan increasing the amount of oil Iraq can sell under an "oil for food" program. But a U.N. committee on which the United States sits retains

a veto over every contract. Iraq has yet to accept the plan.

"The real battle is over the money — who is going to control access to \$10 billion to \$15 billion" in projected oil revenue, Bruce Riedel, the top National Security Council expert on the Near East and South Asia, told an Arab-American group in Washington last month. "We are determined to see that this very dangerous regime will not get its hands on this money. We know Saddam won't use it to buy baby formula."

Iraq is making it easy for the United States to stay firm. Chief U.N. weapons inspector Richard Butler said Tuesday, "Regrettably, we're not able to report any progress" in the past six months toward verifying Iraq's claims that it has destroyed chemical and biological arms. Such verification is required by U.N. resolutions passed after Iraq was expelled from Kuwait in 1991.

In power for nearly two decades, Saddam has, through military misadventures, managed to devastate one of the few countries in the region

with a small population and ample oil, water and land. According to the United Nations, about a million Iraqi children under age 5 are chronically malnourished, and annual child deaths have increased from 7,000 in 1989 to nearly 57,000 in 1996.

Diplomats and U.N. officials who visited eight previously off-limits presidential compounds last month found literal palaces with marble floors, chandeliers and giant televisions. There were guest houses surrounded by artificial lakes. A compound at Jabal Makol, north of Saddam's hometown of Tikrit, was built on a mountain and featured artificial waterfalls, visitors said.

The regime also didn't stint on Saddam's birthday celebration. There were rallies and theatrical performances throughout Iraq and a military parade in Tikrit. More murals and statues of the Stalinesque leader were unveiled in a country already glutted with them. "All of Iraq calls out loud, Saddam is the symbol of our homeland," one poster read.

USA Today

April 29, 1998

Pg. 7

'UNKNOWN' SOLDIER: The Pentagon said it is highly possible the remains of a Vietnam War serviceman could be exhumed from the Tomb of the Unknowns before Memorial Day if Defense Secretary William Cohen approves. He is to decide in the next two weeks whether to take the unprecedented step to settle whether the remains, interred in 1984, are identifiable. Relatives of Air Force 1st Lt. Michael Blassie wants DNA tests conducted because they believe his remains are in the tomb at Arlington National Cemetery. The Pentagon says the remains could be those of one of eight other missing servicemen who died in the same area as Blassie in 1972.

— Andrea Stone

Space deal may enhance China's missile program

U.S. offers 'scientific cooperation'

By Bill Gertz
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The Clinton administration has drawn up a space cooperation agreement with China for the upcoming Beijing summit that permits the transfer of technology that also could enhance Chinese strategic nuclear missiles.

The plan would set up "scientific cooperation" in the areas of earth observation, climate change and the environment and is aimed at enticing the Chinese to halt missile cooperation with Iran and Pakistan, administration officials said.

A copy of the draft agreement, obtained by The Washington Times, was given to Chinese officials in Beijing last month during the visit by John Holum, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and nominee for undersecretary of state for arms control, and Assistant Secretary of State Robert Einhorn.

The proposed pact would be part of a 1979 U.S.-China science and technology cooperation accord and says the United States and China "shall identify areas of mutual interest and seek to develop cooperative projects in the use of space for research and practical applications."

Other countries could take part in the programs, the draft states.

The pact, labeled "confidential," would be signed by representatives of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and State Science and Technology Commission of China (SSTCC), a key developer of weapons-related technology.

The SSTCC was recently renamed the Ministry of Science and Technology.

A Senate Republican aide said the SSTCC is the same organization that concluded a 10-year agreement with Iran in 1990 to share military technology. "Under

this agreement, American space technology would pass automatically to the Iranian missile program," the aide said.

The Justice Department is investigating whether two U.S. high-technology companies, Hughes Electronics Corp. and Loral Space & Communications Ltd., improperly shared missile data with China that significantly boosted Chinese strategic missiles, according to U.S. officials. Both companies have denied doing anything wrong in analyzing a 1996 Chinese space-launch failure for Beijing.

U.S. officials hope the agreement could be signed at the summit of President Clinton and Chinese President Jiang Zemin set for late June in Beijing.

A State Department spokesman said yesterday that the proposal "is still under discussion" and that it is not clear that the pact will be concluded in time.

The draft agreement says NASA and the SSTCC "will exchange scientific data freely and without restriction," except for corporate information not under government control, the draft "memorandum of understanding" (MOU) says.

"Data and data products generated as a result of cooperative activities under this MOU shall be made available to any requester for no more than the cost of fulfilling the user request," it said.

Cooperation areas would include research in atmospheric science, solid earth and geodynamics, calibration and validation of new sensors, topographic mapping, satellite instrumentation observations and measurements, and student and scientist exchange programs and educational activities.

Officials familiar with the proposed agreement said plans to include provisions allowing for the transfer of space and rocket technology and equipment requiring

U.S. export licenses were dropped from the draft before it was presented to the Chinese in March.

Within the administration, officials have said the space cooperation accord would be part of a "missile deal" with China aimed at ending Beijing's transfer of missile technology to Iran, Pakistan and other states seeking to build or buy missiles.

The deal, disclosed by The Times on March 18, would include speeding up consideration of U.S. exports to China of goods controlled by the 29-nation Missile Technology Control Regime.

According to a March 12 memorandum labeled "secret" and written by Gary Samore, the White House National Security Council proliferation specialist, the draft agreement for U.S.-China space cooperation is linked to China's "meeting our conditions for joining the [Missile Technology Control Regime] and controlling its missile-related exports to Iran, Pakistan, etc."

U.S. intelligence reports have identified China's Great Wall Industries as supplying missile test equipment to Iran's medium-range Shahab missile program. The CIA also said in a report last year that during 1996 China "was the most significant supplier of weapons-of-mass-destruction-related goods and technology to foreign countries."

"The Chinese provided a tremendous variety of assistance to both Iran's and Pakistan's ballistic missile programs," the CIA said, noting that Beijing also transferred nuclear-related equipment and technology to Pakistan.

Henry Sokolski, a former Pentagon official, said the proposed agreement appears to be an effort by the White House to coax the Chinese into ending missile sales to rogue states.

"It looks like we're cooperating while they're proliferating," said Mr. Sokolski, director of the Non-proliferation Policy Education Center. "What it is going to do is increase the number of folks with access to our space industry, and it could make it easier for them to get at military-related technology."

The areas of proposed cooperation appear harmless, Mr. Sokolski said, and offering the exchanges is not likely to prevent the Chinese from selling missile and other weapon technology abroad.

"You have to wonder if something like this agreement can beat these guys into restraint with carrots," he said. "The question is, where's the stick?"

Japanese Move To Broaden Military Links To The U.S.

New York Times

April 29, 1998

By Sheryl WuDunn

TOKYO -- The Japanese Government submitted legislation to Parliament Tuesday to broaden military ties with the United States and allow it to offer logistical support to American forces here in the event of a crisis.

Many sticky issues remain to be overcome, but the new legislation brings Japan a step closer to playing a larger security role in the region. The measures also represent an effort to translate a conceptual agreement hammered out with the United States last fall into a reality.

Some experts worry that Japan will be unable to help the United States in a military crisis, like another Korean war, and that recriminations and a fraying of the security relationship between Washington and Tokyo could result. The new legislation is intended to reduce that risk by insuring that Japan will be able to back up American troops in any future crisis in the region.

"It is indispensable for Japan and the United States to coordinate and develop active diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific region for the peace and stability in the region," said Keizo Obuchi, Japan's Foreign Minister.

Earlier in the day, Secretary of States Madeleine K. Albright and Obuchi signed a

related agreement that underscores the expanded support from Tokyo.

American officials welcomed the new moves by Japan, but some Asian countries, still traumatized by Japan's invasions of its neighbors early in this century, are deeply suspicious of any step that would allow it to play any security role whatsoever beyond its immediate territory.

In addition, there is still some trepidation, particularly in China, that a stronger and broader military relationship with the United States could upset Asia's current stability.

"It does raise new questions about the role Japan should play in the region," Masashi Nishihara, professor of international relations at National Defense Academy, said of the legislation submitted Tuesday.

But the more immediate issue, he said, is exactly what Japan's military relationship with the United States should be. The two countries agreed last September to spell out a stronger military relationship in Asia, but there is a sense among some scholars and leaders here that Japan needs to become a bit more independent in making decisions on security issues.

"Sometimes Japan should be able to say no," Nishihara said. "And sometimes it might like to say how American forces should be operated here, but

today it just tends to blindly follow the U.S."

The debate about the guidelines for military cooperation with the United States has helped erode a traditional taboo in Japan about discussing security affairs. In recent years there has been a more frank discussion of whether Japan should back up the United States in international waters or whether this would risk entangling Japan in American quarrels with countries like China.

Under the old guidelines set in 1978, Japan would perhaps not have provided even food, water and other nonmilitary supplies to the United States forces here in the event of a war. Japan also might not have allowed the United States to use its civilian airports.

The new legislation paves the way for Japan to begin working out how to provide such cooperation, though it will remain limited. And it will allow the Self-Defense Forces, as Japan calls its troops, to carry weapons to protect themselves and Japanese civilians during missions abroad.

Today's legislation also expands the scope of the bilateral security arrangement from defending only Japan's territory to providing support for the American military in the Far East and its vicinity.

But just exactly how far it will extend that support is a

highly delicate issue.

The geographical breadth of the arrangement has been a bitter point for China, which does not want to see Japan stepping into the Taiwan Strait area.

Japan, in turn, does not want to offend its giant neighbor, though it also wants to help maintain stability in the area.

"The main purpose is not fighting a war but preventing a war," said Akio Watanabe, professor of international relations at Aoyama Gakuin University. "If we're very careless, we may unnecessarily provoke Beijing."

When the Yomiuri Shimbun, a leading national daily, reported this week that the region to be covered would be "the Far East and its vicinity," including the Taiwan Strait and the Spratly Islands, the Government immediately denied that it would decide in advance which areas should be covered by the guidelines. Instead, said Kanezo Muraoka, the Government's chief Cabinet Secretary, a decision will be deferred until an emergency arises.

If Tuesday's legislation is approved by Parliament, the Government may seek the cooperation of municipalities to allow American forces to use civilian airports and harbors. But in another complication some local governments, particularly on the island of Okinawa, are expected to resist.

European Stars & Stripes

April 29, 1998

Pg. 1

Riots Prove Peace Still Far Off In Bosnia

Refugees Turned Back After Fights

By Jerry Merideth
Bosnia Bureau

SVJETLICA, Bosnia and Herzegovina — This former Muslim village sitting atop a hill overlooking the Serbian town of Doboj was silent Tuesday, the Bosnian Muslim residents driven away by ethnic violence.

There were no signs of the gunfire and grenade explosions that rocked the village in Bosnia's Serbian republic on Sunday and led to Serbian and

Muslim roadblocks on the road between Tuzla and Doboj.

What caused the violence remained unclear. Just as murky was the international community's response to the Serb vs. Muslim tensions centered around Svjetlica and the question of "when, not if" Muslims would return.

According to reports from Republika Srpska — the Serbian entity in Bosnia — five Serbs were wounded when a Muslim tossed a hand grenade into the well they were repair-

ing on the hill below Svjetlica. The Muslims claim, however, that they were attacked at 6:30 p.m. Sunday by a band of Serbs armed with weapons and hand grenades. The villagers suffered no major injuries, officials said.

About 25 Muslim families from Svjetlica fled to Stanic Rijeka, in Muslim territory. There, they built a barricade of bucket-size limestone rocks across the road and reinforced it with a woven mesh of wire box springs and barbed wire.

Muslim townspeople pulled a farm tractor and trucks across the road facing Serbian territory.

In response, Serbs built their own roadblock on the Serbian side of the road to Doboj.

The Muslim barricade in Stanic Rijeka was designed to get the international community's attention, according to Fadil Banjanovic, the director of the office that coordinates the return of refugees for the Tuzla-Podrinje Canton.

"Before the blockade, no one came here. For five days no one came to the village. But when they put up the blockade

everybody came here — the United Nations, the UNHCR — everybody is here.”

Svjetleca is the “private property” of 220 to 230 families, which include roughly 1,000 Muslims, that had received approval from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to return to their home, Banjanovic said. But the village is also home to many Serbian refugees displaced during the war.

Muslim villagers had tried three times before last week to return to their deserted village but were turned away by international officials who said “it’s not the right time politically,” Banjanovic said.

On April 22, they decided to return without international approval. The Muslims intended to return to their village, Banjanovic said, explaining that they had already applied to Republika Srpska for identity cards.

He said if the international community did not want to help, “the people would go back on their own.”

On Monday afternoon, returnees met with several officials, including canton Gov. Sead Jamakosmanovic; Fadil Banjanovic, director of Tuzla’s office for resettlement; and Santiago Romero, the UNHCR representative.

After an often heated discussion, the Bosnian Muslim officials moved toward their car and found Muslim women sitting on the car’s trunk, waving their hands and shouting “We want to go home.”

The violence in the village, following recent civil unrest in Drvar in northwest Bosnia and Derventa in the Republika Srpska, is a sign that tensions in the region are escalating, said Romero.

“Cooler heads will have to prevail,” he said. “I understand the frustration of the people of Svjetleca because they’re not in their homes. But some are, and the Doboj municipality in the Republic of Srpska has been one of the municipalities to receive the most returnees.

“The return of refugees is a slow and painful process. “It’s a process that we’re working on — identification and visits — all of these things that are so painful because there’s so much distrust.”

Romero said the road barricades and the violence reported by both sides would make the resettlement of Svjetleca more difficult, adding: “These kinds of activities will affect the return in a way that will increase tensions.”

Further negotiations to remove the blockades ended at 7 p.m. Monday without success, according to a spokesman for the United Nations’ international police task force in Tuzla.

After waiting 24 hours for local police to reopen the road, Stabilization Force troops moved in to remove the barricades. Once the Nordic Polish Brigade troops took down the barrier on the Doboj road, Muslim refugees dismantled theirs at Stanic Rijeka.

Forensic team exhuming mass grave in Croatia

Forensic experts started digging Tuesday at a mass grave in a Croatian town near Vukovar where they expect to find the bodies of more than 1,000 soldiers and civilians killed during the Bosnian war.

“The exhumation is certainly one of the biggest that is, or has been, carried out,” said Ivan Grujic, head of a Croatian commission for missing persons.

USA Today

April 29, 1998

Pg. 7

Officials believe the victims were rounded up and executed during the siege of Vukovar by Yugoslav and Serb paramilitary troops in October 1991. Some of the bloodiest fighting in the Bosnian war took place there.

So far, officials have unearthed 42 corpses buried in a trench. Most of the bodies were packed in black plastic bags.

Twelve other nearby trenches should yield about 1,120 bodies, Grujic said.

The exhumation and identification process is expected to take up to nine weeks.

More than 200,000 people were killed or reported missing during the war, which pitted Bosnians, Serbs and Croats against each other from 1992 to 1995.

Richmond Times Dispatch

April 29, 1998

Pg. 4

Bosnian war weapons keep turning up in West

‘Central, Eastern Europe are awash in this stuff’

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

AMSTERDAM, Netherlands — First there was giggling, then raucous laughter. A deafening blast and the tinkling sound of a thousand shards of glass. Thirty seconds of silence. Then screams — and sirens.

Khalid Lemqaddem was only 8 years old; his best friend, Othman Zarouali, only 10. It was

April Fool’s Day afternoon this year, and the two Moroccan-born school chums were playing on the sidewalk with the hand grenade they’d just found in a nearby park.

The grenade, authorities say, came from the former Yugoslavia, whose war surplus has become the latest source of light arms and explosives for militants, gang members and petty street criminals throughout Western Europe.

■ In Paris in February, French police detained three suspected collaborators of the Basque separatist group ETA who were armed with Serbian grenades and other weapons.

■ In December, someone fired two anti-tank grenades into an Amsterdam car dealership, heavily damaging it. A police commando unit concluded the grenades were Yugoslav-made.

■ Slovenian border police last year arrested a former soldier of the NATO-led peace force in Bosnia after the Austrian was caught trying to smuggle grenades and other arms in a spare gas tank of his truck.

“There’s a rising tide of this weaponry, and law enforcement seems to think it can’t do anything about it,” said Daniel Plesch, director of the British-American Security Information Council, which advises governments on small-

arms trafficking.

"Central and Eastern Europe are awash in this stuff. Yet it's not really on anybody's screen."

Dutch authorities say the number of grenades circulating on the black market has increased fourteenfold since the signing of the 1995 Dayton accords ending Bosnia's war. Estimates run into the tens of thousands.

Last year, according to the Dutch Central Research Information Service, people found 48 grenades. The phenomenon peaked along with the war: in 1994, 163 grenades turned up; in 1993, 160.

Practically all of them, authorities say, bore markings indicating they either were made in the former Yugoslavia or were the same Russian- or Chinese-made grenades that were handed out for free by the dozens to the Bosnian Serbs.

"We're concerned about the very weak and porous nature of European Union arms controls," said Brian Wood of London-based Amnesty International. "The weaponry stocks are just not controlled."

Although both the EU and the United Nations last year promised a crackdown on small-arms smuggling, "so far it's not much more than a piece of paper," Wood said. Officials will discuss the problem at the mid-May Group of Eight summit in Birmingham, England.

Grenade trafficking persists despite Operation Harvest, an attempt by NATO troops to get Bosnians to turn in the arms they have stockpiled at home. Eighteen thousand grenades, 3,000 small arms and tons of ammunition have been handed over since the amnesty began in February.

As for weapons being smuggled west, "it isn't something we're concerning ourselves with," says Maj. Peter Clarke, a spokesman for the NATO-led peace force based in Sarajevo. Though it can be risky, difficult and dangerous to get arms and explosives out of the Balkans, Central European border controls have relaxed since the end of the war — and to the west, many have been dismantled completely. Small-caliber handguns, knives and switchblades remain the weapons of choice for street thugs. Grenades, though, have exotic appeal — and they're as cheap as they are deadly.

Dutch authorities say grenades as powerful as the one that killed Khalid and Othman — blowing a hole through the side of an Amsterdam supermarket — are being peddled for as little as \$12.50 apiece.

Amsterdam police have offered a \$7,500 reward for information leading to the arrest of whoever dropped — or planted — that grenade. Forensic tests on fragments have investigators "absolutely sure" it came from the Balkans, spokesman Klaas Wilting said.

Nameless no longer

Although much delicacy is required, the easiest decision Defense Secretary William Cohen will make in the next week is to open the Tomb of the Unknowns at Arlington National Cemetery and see who's buried in the crypt containing a Vietnam War casualty. The bones might belong to 1st Lt. Michael J. Blasie, an Air Force pilot who went down on May 11, 1972. Or to Capt. Rodney L. Strobridge, an Army helicopter pilot shot down nearby the same day.

Or maybe neither. But the work is still worth doing. The Strobridge family isn't totally certain it wants to find out. The Blasies crave the closure. Either way, the Pentagon has a duty to return every casualty home.

The tomb itself demands the attempt. No war memorial is more meaningful to more Americans than the Tomb of the Unknowns. It cuts across generations and decades with equal power. It affirms the greatest sacrifice ever made: more than a warrior's life, a warrior's very name and existence.

The departed might not care, but for the rest of us, the tomb is a constant reminder of our humbling, unpayable debt. The tomb

should remain true to that purpose: its contents tragically unknown, sadly unknowable.

On a shady hilltop not far from the Tomb of the Unknowns sits the Tomb of Unknown Civil War Dead, a massive sarcophagus containing the remains of 2,111 Union dead. There is no honor guard. On a recent visit, rags of clothing lay beneath a nearby hedge. Yet the place is more touching for its lack of daily recognition. Half-forgotten beneath huge oaks, it recalls the erasure of names on a vast scale. And in so doing, it becomes an even more powerful reminder of how important it is to remember those who died anonymously.

The Pentagon says it still has a few candidates for the Vietnam crypt if the current contents are identified. Compare that handful of unknowns to the thousands of Civil War casualties buried 600 yards away, and you get a sense of what modern forensics and record-keeping can accomplish. So are we at the end of unknown soldiers? Let's hope so. The extant memorials have enduring value even if no additions are made. As for the bones beneath the Vietnam slab: They deserve a name more than an honor guard. Whose don't?

USA Today
April 29, 1998
Pg. 12

Jane's Defence Weekly

April 29, 1998

Strategic Bomber Numbers Cut In Russian Reshuffle

Russia will carry out a major reorganisation of the Strategic Aviation Force (SAF), which comprises strategic bombers carrying cruise missiles with nuclear warheads,

announced Gen Anatoly Kornukov, commander-in-chief of the Russian Air Force.

The number of strategic bombers is being cut, with all the units in the SAF transformed into one air army by 1 May.

The air base at Mozdok, North Osetia, Russia's largest strategic air base in the Cauca-

sus, will be closed.

All of the airworthy Tu-95 'Bear' strategic bombers are being flown to an air base in Engels, Saratov region. The rest of the bombers will be scrapped. The base is expected to be closed by the end of next month.

According to the Russian defence ministry, besides the

reorganisation plans, the decision to close the base has been provoked by a "certain threat from the Chechen guerrillas".

The Mozdok airfield is situated 50km from the Chechen border. In all, 316 nuclear warheads will be transported from the Mozdok air base "deep into the Russian territory".

New York Times

April 29, 1998

Stop Worrying About Russia

By Madeleine K. Albright

This week, the Senate will be asked to ratify the admission of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO.

The vote comes at a turning point in European history. For the first time, we have a chance to break the old patterns of conflict and to extend to Europe's eastern half the same recipe that has made war inconceivable in its western half. We finally have a chance to build a Europe whole and free.

But we will not do that by making NATO the last institution in Europe to keep the Iron Curtain as its eastern frontier. We will not do that if Europe's premier security alliance excludes a whole group of qualified democracies simply because they were subjugated in the past. We will not do that if NATO refuses to be open to those free nations that are willing and able to meet the responsibilities of membership.

This is the central issue in the debate over NATO enlargement. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic have met every possible requirement of membership. They are strong democracies with healthy economies. They have helped us resolve virtually every potential ethnic and territorial dispute in their region. Their soldiers have risked their lives in the Persian Gulf war and Bosnia. All three have offered to contribute forces if a military strike is necessary in Iraq.

Yet, as the final vote in the Senate nears, critics have argued that we have not debated the subject long enough. The most diplomatic response I can offer is that this is balderdash. NATO decided to move ahead with enlargement four years ago. Since then, I and other members of the Administration have heard scores of speeches, attended dozens of conferences, read more than a thousand published articles, complied with several Congressional resolutions urging us to move faster, and spoken at a dozen Senate hearings.

In the time we have taken to develop and debate this policy,

the founders of NATO had not only created the alliance, but also enlarged it once. Let's be honest. The critics will never be satisfied. The time has come to decide.

The most fundamental argument the critics have put forward is that the admission of even a single new NATO ally from Central Europe will harm our relations with Russia.

My first response is to wonder why some people cannot discuss the future of Central Europe without immediately changing the subject to Russia. Central Europe has more than 20 countries and 200 million people, with its own history, its own problems and its own contributions to make to our alliance. Most of these countries do not even border Russia. But their security is and always has been vital to the future of Europe as a whole.

Critics who focus on Russia's opposition to enlargement are cynically assuming that Russia will always define its national interests in ways inimical to our own. They believe that Russia will always be threatened and humiliated by the desire of its former satellites to go their own way, that it will never get over the end of its empire. They think Russia's neighbors must set aside their legitimate aspirations indefinitely so that the United States and Russia can get along.

These assumptions not only sell Russia short -- they are also dangerous. If we want Russia to complete its transformation into a modern European power, the last thing we should do is to act as if Central Europe is still a Russian sphere of influence.

As for cooperation between the United States and Russia, I have a pretty good vantage point on that question as Secretary of State, and I have not seen one scintilla of evidence to support the critics' fears.

Russian leaders don't like NATO enlargement, but we have both chosen to cooperate on those issues where we agree, and they are many. We have disagreements on matters like Iraq and Iran -- but these have everything to do with the way

Russia has traditionally pursued its interests in that part of the world, and nothing to do with an issue as distant as Hungarian membership in NATO. We have continued to push ahead with arms control, too. Russia is a year ahead of schedule in slicing apart weapons under Start I. We have agreed on the outlines of a Start III treaty that would cut nuclear arsenals to 80 percent below their cold war peaks. With the confirmation of Prime Minister Sergei Kiriyenko, Start II ratification is back on track in the Duma.

The bottom line is this: we can continue to treat European politics as a zero-sum game, in which Russia must lose if Central Europe gains, and Central Europe must lose if Russia gains. We can stay allied with Europe's old democracies forever, but its new democracies never. Or we can realize that the cold war is over and that Europe has changed fundamentally.

Saying "yes" to a larger NATO would be a good sign that we do understand.

Madeleine K. Albright is the Secretary of State.

New York Times

April 29, 1998

NATO and the Lessons of History

The small but vociferous band of senators opposed to NATO expansion retreated yesterday to trying to sell a series of amendments they hoped would delay enlargement or limit the financial costs to Washington. Only one, offered by Daniel Patrick Moynihan and John Warner, would put off this round of growth by making NATO membership for Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic contingent on their gaining admission to the European Union.

While it was encouraging to see the Senate at last thoughtfully debating the merits of expansion, the significance of the moment seemed to escape many members. Pushing NATO eastward may, as its proponents argue, only reinforce democracy and unity in Europe. We will be pleased if that proves true. But with the Senate now moving toward approval, the consequences could be quite different. The military alliance that played such a crucial role in preserving peace in Europe through the hard decades of the cold war could become the source of instability on that Continent.

The reason enlargement could prove to be a mistake of historic proportions is best explained by comparing the decision before the Senate with the far different course America chose at the end of World War II. America acted then not to isolate Germany and Japan, or to treat them as future threats, but rather to help make them democratic states. It was a generous and visionary policy that recognized that America's interests could be best secured by the advancement of its principles abroad and the embrace of its former enemies.

Now, in the aftermath of the cold war, the United States is taking an entirely different approach to the loser of that conflict. Though it has offered financial assistance and friendship to Russia, the Clinton Administration has made NATO expansion the centerpiece of its European policy. It is as if America had sent Japan and Germany a few billion dollars when the war ended while devoting most of its energy to strengthening a military alliance against those countries.

It is delusional to believe that NATO expansion is not at its core an act that Russia will regard as hostile. At the very moment when Russia is shedding its totalitarian history and moving toward democracy and free markets, the West is essentially saying it still intends to treat Moscow as a military threat. The best way to defend Eastern Europe is not to erect a new barrier against Russian aggression but to bring democracy and prosperity to Russia so it will not be aggressive. The genius of American policy toward Japan and Germany was that it looked to the future rather than the past. It is lamentable that Washington lacks the imagination and courage to do so again.

A vote against NATO

Washington Times
April 29, 1998
Pg. 19

By David Gompert

As the Senate prepares to ratify the enlargement of NATO, the debate has taken a troubling turn. While not questioning the admission of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, Sen. John Ashcroft has offered an amendment to the ratification resolution aimed essentially at limiting NATO's purpose to the Cold War mission of defending the borders of the European allies. Should such a new restriction be imposed, the big loser would be the United States.

Needless to say, Sen. Ashcroft has no intention of harming U.S. security interests. His motivation, it seems, is to keep the U.S. from being drawn into peacekeeping operations, like Bosnia, that the Europeans ought to handle on their own. Reasonable people can disagree about the merits of U.S. involvement in Bosnia and other peacekeeping missions. In some cases, the nation will opt to send forces, as in Bosnia; in other cases, it will not, as in last year's crisis in Albania. But let's be clear: The NATO treaty does not and will not require the U.S. to participate in peacekeeping. The Clinton administration has never claimed that the U.S. has a *treaty obligation* to join its allies in Bosnia.

Thus, the Ashcroft amendment is at best unnecessary. Far worse, it could foreclose a potentially crucial strategic option for the United States, namely, to seek NATO's help in confronting future threats to the common security interests of the Atlantic democracies. In this world of rogue states with biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons poised to seize Western oil supplies, why would we want to restrict NATO's purpose to our coming to the defense of European soil? Why would we want to cut off U.S. options in this unpredictable era? Why would we discard our

chance to get allied support for U.S. security interests?

Wisely, the drafters of the NATO Treaty 50 years ago provided not only for the defense of the territory of the European allies but also for the possibility of common action to protect other interests. The United States wanted this latter provision — not as an obligation but as an option. When the treaty was signed, Secretary of State Acheson proclaimed that it contained no limitations on alliance missions. As long as the Soviets threatened Europe, the defense of allied territory was NATO's overriding concern. But now, the U.S. has begun to ask the Europeans to contribute more to the protection of other common interests, such as oil and security from weapons of mass destruction. It is time for the U.S. not only to give but also to receive security benefits from NATO.

Accordingly, since the Gulf War, when the U.S. had to send nearly all the forces and run nearly all the risks, the Bush administration and the Clinton administration have urged the Europeans to move beyond the Cold War mission of border defense and to join the United States in combating the new threats. This work has just begun to bear fruit: The British, French and Germans have, somewhat reluctantly, agreed to build forces that could help out if, for example, another war erupted in the Persian Gulf. The allies are becoming convinced by the United States that NATO is too valuable — and the world is too dangerous — to restrict its options.

The Ashcroft amendment could derail this effort. By stressing that NATO's only business is to defend European borders, it would remove any motivation for the allies to field better forces for post-Cold War missions and give them a perfect excuse

to let their military readiness decline. By suggesting that the U.S. will not support any other NATO missions, it would guarantee that the allies will not. By disapproving of the use of NATO to combat today's threats it would signal that the U.S. sees the alliance as having little value in the new era. Those Europeans that prefer to see the U.S. face the new era's dangers alone would welcome the Ashcroft amendment.

Worst of all, those who would threaten U.S. and European common interests, such as Iraq, Libya, Iran and Serbia, might be relieved, if also astounded, to learn that the United States was not going to use NATO to face them with a common U.S.-European front, in peacetime and war. These renegades are already trying to split us from our allies. The only thing that would bother and deter them better than U.S. power is U.S. power backed by NATO. The Ashcroft amendment — unintentionally, of course — could rule that out. Upon admitting the three new democracies as members, thus consolidating security within Europe, NATO will turn its attention to how the U.S. and Europeans can work together to combat common threats wherever they might arise. We will be debating and refining such a concept for years to come, and the Senate will have an important voice. By design, the treaty itself neither requires nor forbids new missions. The Ashcroft amendment would pinch off options that the treaty was meant to provide and that the U.S., above all, can now use to its advantage.

David Gompert was senior director for Europe and Eurasia on the Bush administration's National Security Council staff.

Reckless Rush On NATO

Los Angeles Times
April 28, 1998

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott predicts that the resolution to add three members to NATO will pass this week with 70 or more votes, though the Mississippi Republican concedes "there's not a lot of enthusiasm in here" for expansion. That indifference can be seen in the perfunctory debate leading up to the vote. The necessary two-thirds of the Senate appears ready to make NATO bigger for no better reason than that it seems a good thing to do. A decision of basic and enduring strategic importance is not getting the rigorous analytical questioning it cries out for.

Supporters of bringing Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic into the 16-member alliance have pressed their case with slogans rather than arguments. President Clinton promises that expansion will make NATO stronger, allow European democracy

and prosperity to flourish, and "bring Europe together in security, not keep it apart in instability." But examine these soothing assurances and their lack of substance is immediately apparent.

There is no hint here or anywhere else of what mission would be played by a stronger NATO, the alliance formed nearly half a century ago to curb the expansionism of a now-defunct Soviet Union. Nor is any reason given why a military coalition should be considered the best or even a useful vehicle for spreading prosperity and democracy in Europe. Certainly an expanded European Union would seem to offer greater opportunities for economic advancement, while democracy would be better nourished in the context of existing multilateral European political and parlia-

mentary forums. And how does moving NATO's border eastward, so that it abuts Belarus, Ukraine and the Russian enclave of Kaliningrad in Lithuania, help unite the continent and reduce instability? Might not the opposite result?

The Senate is rushing to amend the NATO treaty without even an approximate sense of what it could cost; some credible estimates run to \$125 billion. It is about to extend U.S. security guarantees and the forces to back them to three countries, with

probably more to follow; Clinton has already told Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania that they could be next. But to meet what threat, and with what effect on this country's reduced military capabilities?

Is NATO expansion an irredeemably bad idea? No. But it remains an idea for which no convincing case has yet been made. And that makes the action the Senate is about to take a cause for concern, not celebration.

Lexington (Ky) Herald Leader

April 28, 1998

NATO Expansion Down To The Wire

Yes: Seal The Victory Of The Cold War

By John Shalikashvili

Having recently returned from Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, I feel more convinced than ever that the U.S. Senate should demonstrate overwhelming bipartisan support for including these countries in NATO.

NATO is America's most critical security alliance, and those who have been expressing anxiety of late about its enlargement are overstating the risks.

The primary misgiving about expansion would seem to be that we cannot afford to provoke Russia with such action. Certainly, we must be concerned about the consequences of our foreign policy initiatives. However, if the Cold War validated anything, it was the worth of framing U.S. foreign policy from first principles rather than hypothetical situations.

We engaged in the Cold War and won it because we were unswerving in our belief

in democracy and individual freedoms. We have no reason today to be any less passionate in our defense of these principles. Nor do we have any grounds for walking away from our long-held conviction that stability and prosperity in Europe -- which NATO expansion will widen and deepen -- will strengthen our security and well-being.

But what of Russia? I would argue that NATO expansion ultimately will prove as much a boon for Russia as for us and our current and prospective European allies.

The clear message emerging from Moscow is that the enlargement of NATO to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic already is accepted there as an accomplished fact. Why should we believe what we are hearing? Because history has taught the Russians, perhaps better than us, the threat posed when instability reigns in Eastern and Central Europe. They also understand that, insofar as NATO

enlargement is the stabilizing force for these emerging free markets, Russia will be a beneficiary. Certainly, they see that the potential flash points of ethnic and religious strife in the region more likely will be managed -- and perhaps even managed out of existence -- in the presence rather than the absence of NATO. Remember, too, that Russia already is intimately engaged with NATO in Bosnia.

But the Russia card is not the only one being played by the opponents of NATO expansion. Cost is another consideration, the critics say.

The cost of expanding NATO to include Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic is small. For the 16 existing members, it is expected to total about \$1.5 billion. For each American taxpayer, that amount breaks out annually over the next 10 years to less than the price of a candy bar.

The bipolar world that gave rise to the alliance no longer is operative, and NATO is rede-

fining itself in light of the new realities.

There are urgencies to expanding NATO. It is nearly 10 years since the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the countries of Eastern Europe -- including my native land, Poland -- have waited long enough for a place at the table.

The ineluctable fact remains: The Cold War is over, and it's time for new thinking that goes beyond the old arguments. It's also time for movement, and the notion of "pause" -- a forced delay of some number of years in any consideration of NATO expansion beyond Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic -- strikes me as an ill-advised overreaction to hypothetical situations that we don't know will occur.

NATO enlargement is not against Russia. It is for expanded democracy, free markets, stability and peace in partnership with Russia.

No: Pact Will Bring Instability

By Gary Hart and Gordon Humphrey

The Senate vote on NATO expansion will set the tone of U.S.-Russian relations for the next generation. If the Senate approves NATO membership for Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, NATO will move right up to Russia's border, endangering the once-in-a-century opportunity for the United States to build a constructive relationship with that

vast and important country. Russia is particularly sensitive about its province of Kaliningrad, which shares 432 kilometers of border with Poland.

If the Senate approves the first group of applicants, it can hardly deny membership to the next round of applicants, including Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. Those nations share an additional 734 kilometers of border with Russia. Thus, the United States will have responded to the peaceful disso-

lution of the Soviet empire with an in-your-face deployment of the NATO alliance right on Russia's doorstep. Humiliating a former adversary is a dangerous thing for a great power to do, and we may pay dearly for our arrogance.

There is simply no need to expand NATO. Even the proponents admit that Russia poses no threat to its neighbors, nor could it for many years to come, even under the worst of circumstances.

Eastern and Central Europe do not need a military alliance, they need access to Western markets. Then why the push for NATO expansion? It got started in 1996 as an election-year ploy to pander to American voters who identify with the candidate nations. It has been carried forward on the argument that expanding NATO promotes stability. Everyone is for stability. But how do we promote stability in

present threat to the United States. Resentment of NATO expansion prompted the Russian legislature to delay ratification of the START 2 treaty that would shrink Russian and U.S. arsenals by 3,500 strategic nuclear missiles each. The refusal to ratify that important treaty, despite pleas from Presidents Clinton and Boris N. Yeltsin, is a concrete example of the way NATO expansion strengthens the hands of the irresponsible elements at the expense of Russian reformers.

Further, NATO's encampment right on Russia's borders forces Moscow to rely more heavily on its large stockpile of tactical nuclear weapons left over from Soviet days. Moscow has lately renounced a no-first-strike policy.

Given the decrepit state of its conventional forces, Russia has little choice but to make do. Unfortunately, tactical nuclear weapons can be used to make up for inadequate conventional forces. How does forcing Russia to turn to tactical nuclear weapons promote stability?

Clearly, the United States should go all out to help Russia dismantle its excess nuclear warheads and to bring all warhead materials under strict controls. NATO expansion thwarts that effort, too.

More broadly, NATO expansion poisons the well in U.S.-Russian relations. To contain Soviet communism, we fought two hot wars and a long cold war at an expense of perhaps \$20 trillion. For 45 years, our citizens bore a heavy burden, including the risk of nuclear war. At last, we have an

opportunity to build friendly relations with Russia. NATO expansion puts that priceless opportunity at peril, risking a resumption of a dangerous confrontation.

Retired Gen. John Shalikashvili served as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1993-1997.

Gary Hart and Gordon Humphrey are former U.S. senators, representing Colorado and New Hampshire, respectively.

Washington Post

April 29, 1998

Pg. 20

Kosovo's Downward Spiral

FOR TWO months, the United States and its allies have been warning Serbia that they will not tolerate continuing Serb repression of the Albanian minority in Kosovo. And for two months the Serbs have flouted those warnings. It should be clear by now that empty rhetoric, no matter how fierce, is not going to change the behavior of Serbian strongman Slobodan Milosevic.

The danger of a wider war spilling out of Kosovo and into the Balkan region is growing. Kosovo is historically part of Serbia, but its population is nine-tenths Albanian and only one-tenth Serb. In 1989, Mr. Milosevic, as part of his nationalist opportunism, revoked the political autonomy the region had enjoyed. Upon being excluded from schools and government in their homeland, ethnic Albanians created a parallel system of education, governance and other institutions, illegal but peaceful. But believing that the West has neglected their legitimate demands for more political freedom, some Kosovar Albanians now support a pro-independence guerrilla movement. It is the fighting between these guerrillas and Mr. Milosevic's army and police that could

spiral out of control.

After those police two months ago killed 80 ethnic Albanians, many of them civilians, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright warned that the United States would not "stand by and watch the Serbian authorities do in Kosovo what they can no longer get away with doing in Bosnia." The United States does not support independence for Kosovo, and it has condemned violence by Kosovar guerrillas. But it properly insists that Mr. Milosevic open a dialogue without preconditions with the peaceful Kosovar leadership, that he withdraw his repressive police and that he permit outside observers to monitor conditions in the region.

The so-called Contact Group on the former Yugoslavia -- the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Russia -- met on March 9 and threatened sanctions if Mr. Milosevic did not behave. On March 25, they met again and threatened again. Now another month has passed, and Mr. Milosevic has neither initiated talks nor eased up on the police pressure. The Contact Group is scheduled to meet again today. If all it can muster is more threats, it will have made clear its shared responsibility for the coming explosion.

Washington Post

April 29, 1998

Pg. 20

An Appropriations Dare

CONGRESSIONAL Republicans are once again daring the president to veto an urgent supplemental appropriations bill to which they have added or threaten to add a string of bad policy decisions. If they don't fix the bill he should take the dare, as he successfully has before. They are trying to use the urgent provisions to force him to back down on the rest. He should turn it around -- use the urgency to force them to back down on grounds it's wrong to hold the government hostage. It is wrong, which is why he'd win.

Most of the money in the bill is for disaster aid and to pay the cost of the military operations in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf. To that the Republicans have added or threaten to add:

A sharp cut in backup housing funds for the poor.

A provision whose likely effect would be to prevent the restoration of food stamps to some of the legal immigrants who lost them in the welfare reform bill the president signed before the last election.

A provision that would drive up the cost of college student loans by giving the banks higher interest rates than are likely necessary to ensure their participation in the program, from which they had threatened to withdraw.

At least two retrograde environmental riders.

Denied, meanwhile, would be requests:

For a small amount of money to enforce the Kassebaum-Kennedy health insurance bill, passed with great fanfare two years ago to make it easier for people between jobs or with so-

called preexisting conditions to retain their coverage. The insurance industry is evading some of its terms.

To pay the delinquent dues and assessments the United States continues to owe the United Nations, and to replenish the International Monetary Fund.

This is a bill that does much that it should not do, and not enough of what it should. The president should make them do it right.

Long Island Newsday

Apr. 28, 1998 Pg. 32

Biological Terror

U.S. Proves Unprepared for Biological Terrorism

Federal officials are conceding openly what military and scientific experts have known for some time: The nation's top emergency, medical and investigative agencies are not equipped to handle terror attacks with advanced biological weapons. That's the bad news. The good news is that President Bill Clinton has become aware of the danger from potential epidemics spread by genetically engineered viruses or bacilli. He has made it a priority for the National Security Council to focus on this threat.

The frightening haplessness of state and federal agencies assigned to deal with terror threats came to light this week, one month after a dozen of them engaged in a secret practice session. In the exercise, military, health, police and emergency workers

enacted a scenario predicated on the spread of genetically engineered smallpox along America's southern border. What became clear was how quickly the agencies would be overwhelmed by escalating demands for resources and the public panic generated by the attack.

In the exercise, it took too long for the players to figure out they were dealing with a smallpox epidemic, too long to rush supplies of vaccine to the supposed victims, too long to realize the vaccines weren't working because the virus had been altered genetically. Soon, logistical supply lines were strangled, quarantine

provisions proved inadequate and panic and mounting casualties paralyzed responses, which degenerated into jurisdictional squabbles. At the end, chaos reigned.

Sure, this was just an exercise. But it was also a sobering wake-up call. Clinton was concerned enough to demand a briefing on the national security challenges posed by genetic engineering and biotechnology. Clinton is right to worry. So should all local and state officials who would have to cope with the consequences of such an attack. It's not too soon to ask for whom this bell tolls. It tolls for whomever we entrust with our safety.

Long Island Newsday

April 28, 1998

Pg. 33

Defense Mega-Mergers Weaken the U.S.

By Lawrence J. Korb

AFTER ENCOURAGING and subsidizing more than \$100 billion in defense mergers between 1992 and 1997, the Defense Department has finally said enough is enough by suing to block the \$35-billion merger of Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman. But one wonders why the federal government allowed the number of major defense firms to shrink to four from 50 before taking action.

The ostensible reason for encouraging the consolidation is the decline in military spending, especially on new weapons, since the end of the Cold War. While it is true that spending on new weapons has dropped substantially since the highs of the Ronald Reagan buildup, the fact is that the Pentagon is spending the same amount on new weapons as it did in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Moreover, spending on new weapons is projected to rise by 50 percent over the next three years. (This excludes the \$62 billion in weaponry the United States sold around the world in the past five years, four times more than any other nation.)

Consolidation has allowed the defense industry to have the best of all possible worlds. The Pentagon has permitted industry to offset merger costs by having the government absorb

most of the expense - through customary cost-plus defense contracts - on the theory that the new, bigger company will give the government a better price in the future. But whatever efficiency gains might accrue to the government (and this is by no means assured) will be more than offset by the declining level of competition among these quasi-monopoly suppliers. Profits for defense firms in 1996 were actually higher than they were in 1990, and their stock prices have risen faster than the market.

Washington is correct in stalling on the Lockheed-Martin-Northrop-Grumman combination because of what it will do to real competition in the aircraft and electronics areas. However, it should have used the same criteria to halt the Boeing-McDonnell Douglas and Hughes-Raytheon unions. By approving the Boeing merger, the government allowed one of the three major builders of tactical aircraft to fall by the wayside. Similarly, by permitting Raytheon to buy Hughes, it all but eliminated real competition in the air-to-air missile business.

This point can be illustrated by looking at two recent weapon systems competitions. When the Pentagon asked for bids on the \$300 billion Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program, the only innovative design came from Boeing, which had not been a prime contractor on

a fighter for 40 years. Now that Boeing has been allowed to merge with McDonnell, it is guaranteed some part of the JSF business. In addition, it is now the prime contractor for the F/A-18. There will not be an outside innovator on the next fighter competition.

Similarly when Hughes, which beat Raytheon to build the \$12-billion AMRAM (advanced medium-range air-to-air missile), began to experience severe cost and quality problems, the Pentagon turned to Raytheon to hold Hughes' feet to the fire. This resulted in a 20 percent drop in the missile's unit cost and an improvement in the technology. The next time there is a similar problem, there will be no Raytheon to turn to.

Lockheed Martin, which has already bought up 20 competitors and is the nation's largest defense contractor, has the audacity to claim its merger with Northrop Grumman will increase competition. How can the removal from the arena of \$9 billion Northrop Grumman increase Pentagon choices? What Lockheed means is that with Northrop Grumman, it will be more competitive with Boeing and Raytheon and get more business.

For example, Lockheed Martin builds F-16 and F-22 fighters. Guess who builds the radar for those planes? Guess who would get most of the electronics business on the JSF

if Lockheed wins the race against Boeing? It will not be Raytheon, even if its cost is below Northrop Grumman's. There are at least three inconsistencies in Lockheed's position. First, Lockheed lobbied stridently against Raytheon's purchases of Hughes and Texas Instruments on the ground that it put too many competitors on one team. Second, the Pentagon justified the Boeing-McDonnell merger on the ground that only a mega-company could compete with Lockheed Martin. Third, Lockheed is already quite competitive with Boeing and Raytheon. For example, in early April, Lockheed bested Boeing and Raytheon to get the contract on the Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile, even though the company had never built a cruise missile before!

The Republican Bush administration discouraged the Grumman-LTV and Aliant-Olin mergers on antitrust grounds. Moreover, the supposed "Party of Big Business" adamantly refused to subsidize any consolidations. The defense team in the first Clinton administration allowed the industry to run wild. The new team, headed by a Republican secretary of defense, has finally applied the brakes. It's too bad William Cohen did not come to his job sooner.

Lawrence J. Korb is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution in Washington.

Wall Street Journal
April 29, 1998
Pg. 1

Russia's new premier named eight cabinet members after a meeting with Yeltsin. Seven return from the government abruptly fired by the Russian president last month, including Boris Nemtsov as deputy premier and Yevgeny Primakov as foreign minister, indicating no change of course for Moscow.

Canada's prime minister ended his brief visit to Cuba, and Castro said after his departure that external pressure would never force Havana to change its political system. Chretien, the first Canadian leader to visit since 1976, earlier asked the Communist leader to free four political prisoners.

Don't desert Taiwan

Washington Times
April 29, 1998
Pg. 19

By Frank Murkowski

With news that President Clinton is advancing the date for his ensuing state visit to China, a number of proposals, or trial balloons, are beginning to surface on the subject of a dialogue between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China (PRC).

One possible balloon recently was floated by former Assistant Secretary of Defense Joseph Nye. At least his ideas may be seen as a balloon, given his previous service in the Clinton administration. Mr. Nye's comments are simply the latest indication that the administration, in their effort to pressure Taiwan to negotiate with Beijing, continues to look to third parties to apply this pressure.

I, for one, would welcome the resumption of a fruitful dialogue between the Republic of China on Taiwan and the PRC. Unfortunately, this dialogue was terminated by Beijing in 1995 in a fit of pique over the visit of Taiwan President Lee Teng-hui to Cornell University.

The U.S., however, would do well to ensure that it takes place on mutually satisfactory terms. We promised Taiwan in 1982, as one of the "six assurances," that we would never pressure the island into direct negotiations with the communist authorities on the mainland. Recently we seem to be reconsidering our previous words.

The thesis of these messages, and the whole tone of the administration's recent messages to Taipei delivered through a parade of former government officials, is very troubling. Former Secretary of Defense William Perry, former Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman John Shalikashvili

and former National Security Advisor Anthony Lake have all made "informal" visits to Taiwan in recent months. Reports of these meetings indicate that the message was twofold; Taiwan cannot count on U.S. cover against Chinese attack if it declares independence, and it should start negotiations with China. In effect, they are saying that the Taiwanese should hasten to sit at the negotiating table with a nuclear power that refuses to renounce the use of force against them.

A significant short-term U.S. policy goal should be to press communist China to abandon its threat to use force against Taiwan. These are not idle threats. Indeed, during Taiwan's 1996 presidential election, China conducted missile tests in the Taiwan Strait — an act that brought two U.S. carrier groups into the area. The result was a dangerous situation brought on entirely by communist China.

A U.S. initiative to secure a renunciation of force by Beijing would do even more to facilitate a meaningful dialogue than suggestions already offered. Perhaps most important, it would allow our democratic friends in Taiwan to negotiate with Beijing without a gun to their heads.

The administration's messengers have said that the U.S. should publicly announce that it will not defend a decision by Taiwan to declare independence. While I agree that it is undesirable for Taiwan to make such a declaration, I think such logic is backwards. We certainly do not want to encourage the notion that democratic Taiwan is ripe for the taking.

Our policy of creative ambiguity has long served U.S. interests. Our readiness to display force, as we

demonstrated two years ago when China tried to bully Taiwan and intimidate the island's people out of holding free presidential elections, was also beneficial. We should not change this policy.

The U.S. should continue our commitment to support democracy in Taiwan, and, as outlined in the Taiwan Relations Act, to supply Taiwan with the capability for their own self-defense.

Finally, the administration's messengers suggest that there is nothing but second-class status in Taiwan's future and that Taiwan always will have a minor role in international organizations. The United States should not endorse such a fate. With creative solutions, Taiwan could assume its full and rightful place in many international organizations. The Clinton administration, whether it is through current officials, former officials or trial balloons, should not walk away from Taiwan.

President Clinton is scheduled to travel to Beijing for a second summit with President Jiang Zemin of China in June. I would urge him to keep in mind that Taiwan's vibrant democracy and resilient economy are worthy of our support and respect. More specifically, I would urge him to press China to renounce the use of force if there is ever going to be direct dialogue.

The U.S. policy should be to ease tensions and promote future stability in the Asia-Pacific region, in a way that does not abandon the people of Taiwan and the remarkable gains they have made for democracy and economic prosperity.

Sen. Frank Murkowski is a Republican from Alaska.

Jane's Defence Weekly

April 29, 1998

USA Plans To Help Ukraine Eliminate Bombers

The USA is planning to help Ukraine eliminate up to 44 strategic bombers as part of the US Department of Defense's Co-operative Threat Reduction (CTR) programme.

"The CTR programme is preparing to initiate a project in Ukraine to eliminate 25 Tu-95MS 'Bear-H' and up to 19 Tu-160 'Blackjacks'," the Pentagon told Jane's Defence Weekly in a statement. The dis-

mantling of the Soviet-era bombers will fall under a 1993 treaty between the USA and Ukraine to eliminate and prevent the proliferation of Ukrainian nuclear arms and their delivery systems.

US and Ukrainian officials are now in the process of holding "technical discussions on the proper methods, procedures and scope of the assistance required for eliminating the

bombers", said the Pentagon. "Once this is complete, we will begin a formal contracting process, after which the eliminations may proceed."

Forty of the aircraft will be 'eliminated' and of the remaining four, two will be turned into museum exhibitions and two converted to other unspecified uses, said Ukrainian Security and Defence Council secretary, Volodymyr Horbulin.

Washington Post
April 29, 1998
Pg. 3

Corrections

An article yesterday incorrectly described the number of MX intercontinental ballistic missiles deployed as part of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. There are 50 such missiles.

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 28, 1998, Pg. 6.

U.S. asks court not to release Lockheed papers

By Peter Kaplan
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Government attorneys asked a federal court yesterday to block the release of thousands of pages of Pentagon documents that Lockheed Martin Corp. hopes will help prove its case for acquiring rival Northrup Grumman Corp.

In a motion filed in U.S. District Court in Washington, the Justice Department refused to turn over more than 2,100 pages of Defense Department documents demanded last week by Bethesda-based Lockheed, arguing that it would have a "chilling effect" on government officials and hamper "sound government decision-making."

The documents are at the center of a legal battle over whether Lockheed should be allowed to buy Northrup Grumman Corp. in an \$11.2 billion deal that would combine the nation's largest and fourth-largest military contractors.

The government sued last month to block the deal on the grounds that it would mean "higher costs, higher prices and less innovation on U.S. military products."

If the two companies are allowed to join forces, the lawsuit says, the Defense Department would no longer have enough contractors to provide competition on many of its key weapons projects.

The government concluded that the merger would only be palatable if the companies sold off their entire electronics business —

about \$4 billion of their combined operations. The British company General Electric PLC offered yesterday to buy those businesses but did not disclose details.

Lockheed and Northrup have argued that teaming up would enable them to cut costs by \$1 billion a year. They've vowed to pass those savings on to U.S. taxpayers.

In their court filing last week, the companies accused the government of "attempting to cloak essential information" that they need to make their case.

"Consistent with their due process rights, defendants are entitled to know all of the facts DOD has in its possession and evaluated in reaching its conclusions, not simply those facts that the government has selectively chosen to disclose because they help it make its case," the companies argued.

According to the government, the request includes draft memoranda and handwritten notes detailing the "mental impressions and opinions" of Pentagon staff.

The government has turned over more than 200 boxes of documents to the companies' attorneys. But the companies said they consisted mostly of press releases, public filings and letters they'd written to the companies.

Last week, the companies asked the court to order the disclosure of "internal government documents reflecting extensive, confidential deliberations among Department of Defense lawyers and staff mem-

bers analyzing the competitive implications" of the merger, the government's filing says.

By asking for reams of Pentagon documents, the companies are hoping to turn up documents "that may be inconsistent with [the government's] allegations," according to their filings.

The government's refusal to release the documents prompted one defense industry analyst to speculate they might show that some Pentagon officials supported the merger.

"They must have smoking guns in there if they're trying to stop their release," said Barry Blechman, president of DFI International, a District-based defense consulting firm.

"They need to defend that decision," Mr. Blechman said. "We don't live in a country where the government makes rulings like that — that can't be defended in a public light."

In its response yesterday, the Justice Department dismissed the idea that the documents are crucial to Lockheed's case. Turning them over, on the other hand, would "seriously undermine" the Pentagon and strip it of "fundamental privileges that protect such government deliberations."

U.S. District Judge Emmet Sullivan has scheduled a May 6 hearing on the documents issue. The lawsuit goes to trial Sept. 8.

Legi-Slate

April 28, 1998

Defense Department Seeks To Remove Barriers To Hispanic Recruitment

By George C. Wilson
Legi-Slate News Service

WASHINGTON (April 28) — The Pentagon is reviewing the entrance standards of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps to determine if they should be changed to enable more Hispanics to get in uniform, the Pentagon's manpower chief told LEGI-SLATE News Service this week.

Population trends, the desire of Hispanics to sign up, a shortage of volunteers and pressure from Hispanic organizations to open the military's door wider all have given impe-

tus to the review being conducted by Rudy F. de Leon, Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness.

Hispanics are the fastest growing racial group in the U.S. population. Their 18-year-olds, prime targets for military recruiters, are projected to increase from 13 percent of the nation's 18-year-olds in 1996 to 20 percent in 2050. Hispanics aged 18 through 44 comprised 11 percent of the general population in 1996 but only 6.9 percent of the total number of soldiers, sailors, air personnel and Marines on active duty.

"Even Stevie Wonder, if he

were in the Army, would say we have to find a way to get in more Hispanics," said an Army officer knowledgeable about current recruiting trends. He observed that recruiters are having increasing difficulty finding enough quality volunteers to fill billets in these boom times when the armed forces have to compete with private industry for young people.

The challenge, the officer said, is to get more Hispanics into the services "without making it look like you're lowering standards. That would be a public relations disaster."

Ever since the Persian Gulf War in 1991, Pentagon polls show that Hispanic males and females have surpassed blacks as the racial group most desirous of joining the armed forces. And once Hispanics are in uni-

form, they are the least likely of any racial group to quit before completing their first tours, statistics show. This steadfastness saves the armed services hundreds of thousands of dollars that they would otherwise have to spend to recruit and train replacements.

Hispanic leaders are telling everyone in government who will listen, including President Clinton, that their young people want to serve in the All Volunteer Force at the very time they are badly needed but are being kept out by unrealistic requirements.

"We've got to check our tests to make sure they're representative across the board of a number of cultures, because clearly the attrition rates are telling us a story on Hispanics," said de Leon, interviewed

Monday in his Pentagon office.

He added that he will examine the Army's highly successful program of establishing relationships with black colleges to see if it could be duplicated for Hispanics. Colleges are the source of most of the military's officers.

"If we can find ways to broaden the pool of qualified people, that's a plus," de Leon said. "What the statistics show is that the quality among Hispanics is there. When they're given a chance, they perform as well, if not better, than the other categories that we statistically measure. We've got to come to a way to reconcile our entry standards with the performance we can see."

The Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery of tests taken by every enlistee will get a fresh look, de Leon said. Are those tests "a true measure of capability if you come from a background of diversity?" he asked.

Lt. Gen. Edward D. Baca,

the Mexican-American chief of the National Guard Bureau who has pressed to get more Hispanics into the military, said some of the tests are unintentionally unfair to Hispanics because they do not take cultural differences into account. For example, he said, the accepted answer to a test question of where one places a teacup would be saucer, even through the Hispanic custom is to place the cup on the table.

Raul H. Yzaguirre, president of the National Council of La Raza, a federation of groups championing Hispanic rights, said he has had face to face meetings with President Clinton and Gen. Henry H. Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as part of the council's drive to increase Hispanic representation in the American military. He said they and other government leaders have been verbally supportive but results have been slow in coming.

All the armed services require a high school diplomas

for admittance, although the Army allows 10 percent of its recruits to enter with the equivalent of a diploma, such as a graduation certificate from an acceptable night school or home study program. The diploma requirement prevents many highly motivated and intelligent Hispanic men and women from entering the service and improving their life, according to Yzaguirre and defense manpower officials.

"If the high school diploma is an artificial barrier as opposed to a set of examinations and tests that are more related to actual performance," Yzaguirre said, "I would look at that very seriously and make whatever changes are necessary. I would make sure my recruitment efforts were targeted in the right geographic places, in the right colleges and universities to make sure I was getting a reservoir of people that were more reflective of America."

The armed services on their own are stepping up efforts to recruit Hispanics and to work with Hispanic organizations to encourage youths to stay in school so they can meet admission requirements. But critics like Yzaguirre contend that this is not enough; they say the entrance requirements should be changed without lowering them.

De Leon said that he has not gone so far as to direct the services to increase their Hispanic representation but is taking a brand new look himself at current entrance requirements.

Baca, who winds up a 42-year Army career this year, said "the senior leadership of the Department of Defense is as aware now as I've ever seen it" about the need to make the armed services mirror the general population in racial composition. "So," he said, "I leave with a certain comfort level that they're serious about the problem."

Pacific Stars & Stripes

April 30, 1998

Pg. 3

10,000 U.S. troops going for the Gold in Thailand

BY RICH ROESLER

Stripes Taegu Bureau Chief

TAEGU, South Korea — More than 10,000 U.S. troops from all four armed services — many from Asia-based U.S. units — will head to Thailand next month for annual military exercises with their Thai counterparts.

Due to Thailand's economic crisis, Thai military participation this year will be less than half of what it was last year: from 16,000 troops to 6,250.

Nonetheless, U.S. military officials say the combined exercise, called Cobra Gold, remains one of the largest exercises involving the U.S. Pacific Command this year.

"Thailand is a very staunch ally," Air Force Lt. Col. Kevin Krejcarek, U.S. Pacific Command spokesman, said Tuesday from Hawaii. "They did not want to pull out of the exercise because they realize the importance of it."

The U.S. troops will be on the ground, in the air and at sea during the exercise. Cobra Gold includes units from Japan, Guam and South Korea, as well as Hawaii and Alaska.

U.S. troops will do basic field training, tactical movement and live-fire exercises, said 1st Lt. Aisha Bakkar-Poe, a spokeswoman with the 3rd Marine Expeditionary Force, headquartered on Okinawa.

Thai forces will teach jungle survival, including how to handle snakebites. Thailand has 22 kinds of poisonous snakes and five kinds of poisonous spiders.

Troops coming from East Asia include 3rd Marine Expeditionary Force Marines and sailors from headquarters units of 7th Fleet, based at Yokosuka, Japan. The Air Force's 17th and 31st Special Operations squadrons, based at Kadena, Japan, and Osan, South Korea, also will be involved.

The number of U.S. forces this year — 10,600 — is slightly higher than last year's 10,000.

Despite months of political tension in Thailand's southeastern neighbor, Cambodia, and occasional Thai border clashes with its prickly northwestern neighbor, Myanmar, U.S. military officials say the exercise is nothing more than a regularly scheduled, routine exercise.

This will be the 17th Cobra Gold exercise.

"These things are scheduled well in advance. We're already working on the next one," said Krejcarek.

The Thais are longstanding U.S. allies. Under imperial Japanese occupation during World War II, Thailand was forced to issue a declaration of war against America. But the United States wouldn't accept the declaration from the Thai ambassador.

During the Vietnam War, Thailand provided U.S. forces with valuable airfields and port facilities. Thai military equipment is U.S.- and, lately, Chinese-made.

Thailand hasn't been a member of any defense pact since the breakup of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in 1977.

But it has a military assistance agreement with the United States, which pledges support in case of aggression by another country. It is one of only five countries in the region with which the United States has such a security alliance. The others are Japan, South Korea, Australia and the Philippines.

Thailand provides excellent training opportunities and such exercises boost the two countries' familiarity with each other's weapons, tactics, training and language, said Krejcarek.

"You can't fight side by side with somebody you don't know," he said.

The exercise, like last year's, will include Navy SEALs, though Krejcarek or Bakkar-Poe couldn't say much about what the special forces units will do in training.

"It's one thing we don't talk very much about," said Krejcarek.

In addition to the training, U.S. medical and veterinary units will hold free clinics in rural areas, providing glasses, dental and health care, livestock vaccinations and other treatment. U.S. engineering units plan to build small schools and other structures.

It is typically hot this time of year in Thailand, with temperatures routinely hovering around 100. All participating troops have been vaccinated against Japanese encephalitis and hepatitis A and B, said Bakkar-Poe. Troops in some areas will take anti-malaria pills.

"What the Thais are used to, we're not," she said.

White House expected to veto legislation**Senate Passes Bill Requiring Greater U.S.-Russia Missile Defense Cooperation**

The Senate yesterday (April 28) approved legislation that would foster greater cooperation between the United States and Russia on missile defense programs as well as require the Clinton administration to secure Senate approval before making adjustments to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty.

The much-debated "Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998" (H.R. 1757) was passed by the House in March. The bill, however, is likely to be vetoed by President Clinton, who opposes language in the bill not related to missile defense.

Indeed, the bill's missile defense provisions are obscured by the controversy over the bill's limits on international family planning aid and authorization for payment of arrears to the United Nations.

The ballistic missile defense-related clauses of the bill are contained in sections 1702(c) and 1705 of Title XVII, known as the "European Security Act of 1998."

Section 1702(c), entitled "Policy With Respect to Ballistic Missile Defense Cooperation," states that "as the United States proceeds with efforts to develop defenses against ballistic missile attack, it should seek to foster a climate of cooperation with Russia on matters related to missile defense." In particular, the measure calls on the United States and its NATO allies to seek cooperation with the Russians in the area of early warning.

The section also stipulates that "even as the Congress seeks to promote ballistic missile defense cooperation with Russia, it must insist on its constitutional prerogatives regarding consideration of arms control agreements with Russia that bear on ballistic missile defense." Additionally, this section calls on the United States and its NATO partners to discuss the feasibility of a ballistic missile defense to protect NATO's southern and eastern flanks against limited missile attack. Section 1705 would implement the policy set forth in section 1702(c). It states that any ABM theater missile defense demarcation agreement must be "specifically approved with the advice and consent of the [Senate] pursuant to Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution."

It also states that it is the "sense of Congress" that "no ABM theater missile defense demarcation agreement will be considered for advice and consent to ratification" unless the president, consistent with the administration's commitment under amendments to the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe, submits to the Senate any amendment that would add one or more parties to the ABM Treaty, or change the geographic scope of the ABM Treaty, including modifying the term "national territory."

Third, this section states the "sense of Congress" that it will approve no ABM TMD demarcation agreement that would "reduce the capabilities of United States theater missile defense systems, or the numbers or deployment patterns of such systems."

Finally, section 1705 stipulates that no later than January 1, 1999, and January 1, 2000, the president shall submit to the respective House and Senate defense committees a report on U.S.-Russian cooperative ballistic missile defense projects, including those in the area of early warning. The report must include a description of the projects, including funding, during the preceding fiscal year and the year during which the report is submitted. Additionally, proposed funding for projects for the next fiscal year must also be addressed. Furthermore, the report will include the status of dialogue or discussions aimed at exploring the potential for mutual accommodation of outstanding issues between the two countries relating to ballistic missile defense and the ABM Treaty, "including the possibility of developing a strategic relationship not based on mutual nuclear threats."

Rep. Benjamin Gilman (R-NY), chairman of the House International Relations Committee, introduced the "European Security Act" as a separate bill in June 1997. The main purpose of the House bill was to address Republican concerns over NATO enlargement, U.S.-Russian relations in lieu of the NATO Founding Act and revisions to the CFE Treaty, and missile defense. The House later incorporated the act into H.R. 1757.

The original wording of the section on the "sense of Congress" concerning multilateralization of the ABM Treaty differs from the final version. At the time legislators drafted the act, the administration still opposed submitting any ABM multilateralization agreement to the Senate for its consent, representing the view that "it belongs exclusively to the president to interpret and execute treaties" (*Inside Missile Defense*, July 10, 1996, p. 17). On its behalf, the Justice Department had prepared a document that concurred with the administration's assertion.

Thus, the original language of the provision had a harsher tone: "It is the sense of the Congress that until the United States has taken the steps necessary to ensure that the ABM Treaty remains a bilateral treaty between the United States and the Russian Federation, such state being the only successor state of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that has deployed or realistically may deploy an anti-ballistic missile defense system, no ABM TMD demarcation agreement will be considered for approval for entry into force with respect to the United States." Although a "sense of Congress" is not legally binding, the language was meant to make congressional opposition to the administration's policy clear.

When the Senate Foreign Relations Committee took up the issue of ratification of the CFE Flank agreement in May 1997, it stipulated as condition nine of its resolution of ratification that the administration must submit to the Senate any agreement concerning the ABM Treaty that changed the treaty from a bilateral to a multilateral treaty, or that modified the geographic scope of coverage, including the meaning of the term "national territory." Although the administration opposed this stipulation on principle, it did finally concede to it. Ratification of the CFE Flank Agreement was a crucial step in allaying Russian concerns over NATO expansion. Additionally the administration sought to prevent acrimony at a time when it was pushing strongly for ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The final version of the multilateralization provision parallels the language of condition nine of the resolution of ratification of the CFE Flank document and is meant to serve as a reminder to the administration of the commitment it made, according to a

congressional source.

This same source told *Inside Missile Defense* the administrations' consent in this regard forced it to go back and renegotiate the ABM multilateralization agreement it had concluded with Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russia and Ukraine. According to the source, the original multilateralization agreement called for a 60- to 90-day grace period during which each of the five parties could deposit its respective instrument of ratification and accede to the revised treaty. Once the administration conceded to submit the multilateralization agreement to the Senate, it knew that it could not win consent on an amendment that did not clearly define the parties to the treaty at the time it would be submitting the agreement for consent.

The authorization bill itself was also introduced in the House of Representatives on June 3, 1997. Congress sidetracked it in November 1997 after failing to come to agreement over the clauses authorizing payment of U.N. arrears and limiting aid to international family planning agencies that support abortion.

Both houses finally reached agreement in mid-March 1998. The House approved the authorization bill on March 26 before the Easter recess. With the Senate approval, the bill next goes before President Clinton, who has already threatened to veto it over its anti-abortion provisions. Conservative Republicans oppose, for their part, the U.N. payments and most Democrats oppose the abortion language as well. Thus, it is not certain whether Congress will be able to override a presidential veto with the required two-thirds majority.

The bill also contains provisions to enact the dissolution of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the transfer of its functions to the state department (Title II); in place of the ACDA director, the bill mandates creation of an under secretary for arms control and international security in the State Department. -- *Michael C. Sirak*

Wall Street Journal

April 29, 1998

Pg. 1

Flown to Iran for Safekeeping in 1991, Iraq's Best Planes Are Going Nowhere

By Daniel Pearl
Staff Reporter of
The Wall Street Journal

TEHRAN, Iran -- Iraq and Iran, sworn enemies, have had high-level meetings in recent weeks to discuss exchanging prisoners, opening the border and ending their state of war.

One other thing: Iraq would like to have its airplanes back.

As allied pilots began dropping smart bombs on Iraqi hangars in the 1991 Gulf War, Saddam Hussein ordered Iraqi pilots to fly 100-odd jets to three Iranian air bases near the border. Iranians say the planes were unexpected and unwelcome, and they won't return them.

Double-Crossed?

The Iraqis are annoyed. Saddam Hussein, in a speech last year, referred to the episode as "the chapter of treachery and treason," saying Iranian officials encouraged Iraq to battle allied forces -- and then withheld support. Iraq says Iran accepted the planes for safekeeping and should now fork them over. Iran doesn't deny the subject came up during the recent talks but says there is really nothing to discuss. Returning the planes would violate United Nations economic sanctions against Iraq, says Deputy Foreign Minister Javad

Zarif, interviewed in Tehran. "We're constrained by the requirements of the sanctions," he says.

Besides, Iran has property claims of its own -- against Iraq: The eight-year war Iraq started by invading Iran in 1980 caused damage estimated at \$1 trillion. The planes now held by Iran were worth just a small fraction of that when they landed in Iran, and Mr. Zarif notes that Iran has incurred costs in warehousing them and in rolling out antiaircraft batteries during the Gulf War to protect them.

Saddam Hussein might have use for the planes now. U.S. forces are still at full strength in the Persian Gulf, and a new crisis may be brewing over Iraq's attempts to shake off economic sanctions; Tuesday, the U.N. again refused to lift them. Iraq has another 300 or so fighters on its own soil, but they are believed to be the least of its air force.

On the other hand, if Iran truly has kept the best Iraqi planes parked for seven years, "the tires are going to go flat," says Michael Eisenstadt of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, who has tried to make a study of the matter. "They may not even be able to start the engines up, or operate the hydraulics," he adds. "They're probably nonfunc-

tional at this point."

Getting a fix on things isn't easy. Iranians understandably won't say where the planes are. Mr. Zarif says the 100-plane figure is an exaggeration, particularly since some of the planes crash-landed in Iran, but he won't say how many intact planes there are. "We're not in the counting business," he says.

Erstwhile Iraqi Chief

Wafiq al Samerrai, Saddam Hussein's intelligence chief during the Gulf War, says Iran at one point denied it had any planes at all when in fact Iraq sent 113 fighter jets, including MiG-15s and Mirages. Gen. Samerrai, who defected in 1994 and now lives in London, says that while sending the planes to Iran wasn't exactly a stroke of genius on the part of his former boss, Iran was hinting before the war that it would give Iraq indirect aid against the allies.

For one thing, after a trip to Tehran by Saddam's vice president, Iran agreed to give haven to more than 30 civilian planes, Gen. Samerrai says. (Iran denies that.) For another, Iranian officials agreed to return an Iraqi pilot who got lost and landed in Iran. They let him take the plane home, too.

By most accounts, Iran got no warning that the Iraqi war planes were headed its way in 1991. Indeed, Gen. Samerrai

says he himself didn't know anything about it until the pilots started returning to Iraq. On landing in Iran, they had been taken straight to interrogation rooms on the bases and asked questions such as, "How many medals did you get from the Iran-Iraq war?" and "What Iranian targets did you attack during the Iran-Iraq war?" Except for a few who defected, the Iraqi pilots were driven back to the border and allowed to go home. Gen. Samerrai says the interrogators' questions convinced him Iran wasn't going to help Iraq, but Saddam Hussein insisted on sending the rest of the planes anyway.

The tactic had worked before for Iraq. Ken Petrie of the Royal Institute for Strategic Studies in London says that while serving as a pilot in Britain's Royal Air Force, he saw Iraqi planes parked at a Saudi Arabian air base at the start of the Iran-Iraq war. The planes -- painted in Iraqi airline colors, but with machine guns sticking out -- stayed a few days and then returned to Iraq, he says.

Today, Iraqis are saying that Islamic teachings call for its war planes to be similarly returned. On the sidelines of the Organization of the Islamic Conference summit here in December, members of the Iraqi delegation quoted a verse from the Koran to an Iranian journalist. The verse requires anybody who agrees to care for someone else's property to return it.

"The Koran also says any-

body who kills one person kills all of humanity," observes Ayatollah Baqir Al-Hakeem, leader of the Supreme Council for Islamic Resistance, an Iraqi dissident group based here. "So what can you say about Saddam Hussein, who has killed millions of people and de-

stroyed big cities?"

For the record, Iran denies that it has made use of any Iraqi fighter planes. Iran Air did repaint and reuse one civilian Iraqi jet after discovering that it was actually an Iranian jet that Iraq had captured and repainted during the Iran-Iraq

war, says Ahmad Reza Kazemi, chairman of Iran Air. One diplomat says he saw a Boeing 747 parked near the main runway of Tehran's international airport, repainted white but with a touch of Iraqi green showing through. The rest of the civilian planes are scattered

around different Iranian airports, including Shiraz and Esfahan.

"All the planes are grounded," says Mr. Kazemi. "Don't worry about them. They are waiting for delivery at the appropriate time."

Defense Daily

April 29, 1998

Pg. 7

Gov't Offers To Settle Unisys-Lockheed Suit For \$4.4 Billion

The U.S. Government this week filed a \$4.4 billion demand to settle a "whistleblower" lawsuit against Unisys Corp. [UIS] and Lockheed Martin [LMT] that alleges that the companies defrauded the government by selling the U.S. Navy million dollar computers after falsely telling the Navy it would not be possible or practical to shift programs to commercial devices available at about \$20,000.

Erik Gundacker, a software engineer from Minnesota, filed the lawsuit under the False Claims Act earlier this year.

The filing of the settlement demand came under the requirements of a federal court rule that directs the parties to engage in settlement discussions to see if a case can be settled.

The actual amount of the fraud and the trebling of damages, applied in cases of fraud under the False Claims Act, are factored into the settlement demand of \$4.416 billion.

According to Gundacker's complaint, Unisys instructed software engineers to lie to the U.S. Navy and provided false information to the Navy in 1991, persuading it to pay millions for obsolete computer systems which it still purchases today.

According to a statement released yesterday by the law firm representing Gundacker, he estimates that Unisys sold the U.S. Navy 300 of these systems per year from 1993 through 1997. At \$1 million each, the cost of these 1,500 systems would be \$1.5 billion. The cost of the alternative systems, which could have been set up to handle the needed programs, is \$20,000, which for 1,500 computers is \$30 million. By subtracting the \$30 million for the easily substituted computers from the cost of the obsolete systems, \$1.5 billion, a figure for actual damages of \$1.47 billion is the result, the statement says.

In addition, Gundacker has alleged a range of other frauds which together represent a total of \$2 million. Finally, the actual frauds of \$1.472 billion are multiplied by three, as per the False Claims Act, for a settlement demand of \$4.416 billion, the statement adds.

If successful, the vast majority of the funds awarded would be directed to the U.S. Treasury.

The other frauds alleged by Gundacker include mischarging labor costs, falsely charging the government for leasing surplus computers, using falsified rates in proposals, illegally charging marketing costs, illegally transferring contract overruns to accounts with surpluses and submitting false disclosures to the government.

Meanwhile, Lockheed Martin and Unisys have said the charges were part of an earlier wrongful discharge action that was dismissed.

New York Times

April 29, 1998

Words Of Warning In NATO Battle: Senators Tilt At Europe's Future

WASHINGTON -- Following are excerpts from the Senate debate Monday and Tuesday on a measure to expand NATO to include Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic, as provided by The Congressional Record and senators' offices. The passages on Tuesday's debate focus on a proposed amendment, which was defeated, to limit U.S. spending.

TOM HARKIN, D-Iowa: If this amendment had been in effect 50 years ago we couldn't have been in Greece. But that was during the cold war. That is when we were facing the Soviet Union. That is when we were facing, if I might say to the Senator from Delaware, facing a Europe that was on its knees, busted, broke, basically

decapitated from World War II. There is no way that they could have done it on their own.

That is why I say with this whole NATO argument that it just seems to me we are arguing about a world that existed 50 years ago. The Senator from Delaware in his impassioned pleas is arguing for a situation that no longer exists. Europe is powerful.

Europe is wealthy, and the nations' GNP's are going up. There is no Soviet Union. There is no external threat like Greece was facing. Europe has been rebuilt. The cold war is over. Let's look ahead.

What I am saying is that I don't believe, in the context of a Europe that we see now and in the foreseeable future, that our taxpayers ought to be liable

for the national costs any more in excess of what they are liable right now for the common costs.

That is what this amendment says. Very simply, it says very forthrightly, "Any future United States subsidy of the national expenses of Poland, Hungary or the Czech Republic to meet its NATO commitments, including the assistance described in subparagraph (c), may not exceed 25 percent of all assistance provided to that country by all NATO members."

When it comes to tanks, planes or anything else, of course, we can still sell them. They can still buy from us. But our subsidy to this national effort cannot be more than 25 percent of the total amount of all the countries for that national effort. . . .

JOSEPH BIDEN, D-Del.: The Senator from Iowa forth-

rightly responded, as he always does, that if we wanted to sell Poland like we sell Greece or Germany or anyone else a piece of American-made military equipment, as long as we did not subsidize more than 25 percent of what that was, then we could sell it.

I wonder why in God's sake would the French Government agree to come up with money for Poland to allow them to buy an American jet instead of a French jet? Why would they possibly do that? And does this not give a veto, a veto on the part of other NATO nations, over American foreign military sales? Because unless they come up with 75 percent of what any subsidy would be, why would they possibly do that?

Is it not true -- the Senator is on the Armed Services Committee -- is it not true that one of the core debates in NATO

beyond burden sharing has been who gets to sell NATO the equipment, whether they fly Mirages -- whether NATO planes are Mirages or whether they are American-made aircraft? Every other European country in NATO has been saying, "You Americans get too much of an advantage." Every time we talk about burden-sharing, don't they come back and say, "Yes, but you don't get it; you get to make all that money and get all those jobs because you are supplying the equipment that all the NATO uses."

So why in the Lord's name would we give a veto power over the ability of American manufacturers and American employees to keep their jobs to the French and the Germans and the Brits? . . .

GORDON SMITH, R-Ore.: Mr. President, with all due respect to my friend from Iowa, I believe the Harkin amendment attempts to strangle NATO expansion because it cannot prevent this expansion from occurring. This amendment places unreasonable restrictions on expenditures by limiting our assistance to new NATO members to 25 percent of all assistance provided to these countries by current NATO members. . . .

In signing the protocols of accession with these three countries the United States has not signed up to foot the bill for their membership in NATO, and Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic understand that it is ultimately their responsibility to make the necessary improvements to their military structures. . . .

I also confess concern about the signal that would be sent if the Senate adopted the Harkin amendment.

Does approval of this amendment mean that the United States would only lead NATO 25 percent of the time, no matter what our security interests may be? Does it mean that the United States is interested in 25 percent of NATO's activities, exercises and planning processes? Does it mean that the United States should participate in only 25 percent of any potential NATO operations despite any potential threat posed to the alliance? . . .

BARBARA MIKULSKI, D-Md.: I would like to discuss the benefits of enlargement and weigh them against the costs. The strategic benefits of enlargement are most important. NATO enlargement will create a zone of peace and stability that includes eastern Europe. It will extend NATO's stabilizing influence to more of Europe and reduce the chances of aggression or conflict in Eastern Europe.

There are also economic benefits. Europe is America's largest trading partner, with \$250 billion in two-way trade each year. Our new NATO partners will increase trading opportunities. They are building vibrant, free market economies. NATO brings stability, and stability brings prosperity. We are creating a prosperity zone across Europe.

In addition, there are benefits for democracy. For example, the young military officers of new NATO members are learning from us what it means to be part of democratic military. It means civilian control of the military. It means a code of conduct. They are also learning English. When they leave the military they will bring these skills. The training they get from NATO will be a permanent, stabilizing force in their societies. . . .

CHUCK HAGEL, R-Neb.: Aside from the obvious defense purpose of the expansion of NATO, there are other issues involved. The obvious defense purpose of expanding NATO is to help assure stability and security in Europe, all of Europe, Mr. President. And there has been some debate on this floor about this issue, this fourth expansion, and, by the way, an unprecedented expansion. We have expanded NATO three other times to include West Germany, Greece, Turkey and the third expansion, to Spain and Portugal. This would be not an unprecedented action we would take to include three new countries. But I find interesting the fact that there has been some reference made to we would split Europe. And I say, Mr. President, just the opposite. Just the opposite. We would in fact do much to unify Europe. And why would that be?

Well, that would be cause stability, security, economic development, development of democracy, market economies would extend across the continent of Europe, across the continent of Europe. And no longer would there be the iron curtain that fell at the end of World War II. NATO expansion would help assure that.

I also find the argument interesting from the perspective of, I thought when the Berlin Wall fell in 1989 that meant something. It was beyond symbolism. It was a witness to history that authoritarian, totalitarian government does not work under any name -- Nazism, Communism -- it doesn't work.

Here we are almost 10 years after the fall of Communism and the Berlin Wall talking about -- I don't know -- should we do this? We might offend our Russian friends. Certainly any important decision must factor in every dynamic of debate and every dynamic of national security interests, relationships, future relationships and, in this case, certainly does factor in our relationship with Russia. But, my goodness, why did we fight for 40 years a cold war, and we won it?

Only 10 years later, to some extent to be held hostage to what the Russians want. You see, I don't see an awful lot of sense in that. Yes, it's important to understand the Russians. Yes, it's important to engage the Russians. But not allow Russia or any other nation to dominate the final analysis and decisions of our national security interest nor all of the collective security interests of Europe.

FROM MONDAY'S DEBATE

SEN. ROBERT SMITH, R-N.H.: With or without NATO, the United States can come to the defense of any European nation next week, tomorrow, next year or five years from now. Should Europe ever be threatened by Russia, or by anybody else, we can expand NATO. We can do it quickly.

But there is a lot to lose and very little to gain by expanding NATO now. We basically say to Russia: "Don't worry about it. Don't worry about NATO

expansion. It is O.K. It is a defensive alliance."

But it does not matter what we say. It matters what the Russians think. They have stated clearly and officially they oppose expansion. It has been said by others on the floor, and I agree that we should not set our foreign policy based on what the Russians say, I will be the first to admit that, but we ought to realize there is a lot going on inside Russia and there is no threat to these nations from Russia.

So tell me what the threat is. Tell me what the urgency is. There is no urgency. There is no threat. It is an emotional feel-good thing to do. They earned it. They are free. Let us put them under the umbrella of NATO and protect them. From what? We are still going to go to their defense if anything threatens them. Every person in the Senate knows it. The most important requirement for the Poles, the Czechs and the Hungarians as far as their security is concerned is that America and Russia remain friends. That is the protection these nations need, that Russia and America become friends and remain friends. . . .

JOHN WARNER, R-Va.: Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to observe that the American taxpayers, since 1992, have contributed \$2.6 billion in the spirit of that friendship to help Russia dismantle its weapons systems? And here this comes along and takes a red-hot poker and jams it right in their ribs. . . .

SMITH of New Hampshire: It sure does. The Senator knows that. He knows the Senator has worked on this issue tirelessly in the Armed Forces Committee and has visited Russia to see this.

I don't think anybody could deny that in the very near future Russia is going to be one of the, if not the, strongest nations in that region of the world. The question is whose side is it going to be on? Is it going to be on the Iranians' side? Is it going to be an alliance with the Chinese Communists? Or is it going to be on our side? If it is on our side, why will the Poles care or the Czechs or the Hungarians or anybody else? The point is they

wouldn't.

What we ought to be doing again is keeping the window open, using the advantages that we have to draw that out, to draw them this way. Senator Warner has mentioned how they have reached out to do that. We are taking down tremendous numbers of weapons that have been aimed at the United States for decades.

But extending an alliance, which during the cold war the Soviet Union considered hostile, the countries that she doesn't threaten is basically kicking this former giant, like the Senator from Virginia said, poking them in the ribs. . . . That is exactly what we are doing, God knows. I have stood on this floor many times

and in the House Chamber before that and extolled the virtues of the United States against the cold war, the Soviet Union, and voted trillions to defeat it.

But let's not walk away from the victory. Let's not walk away from the victory. History shows that it is unwise to treat nations like that, and it is highly dangerous for countries

in the middle, because these are the countries that are going to suffer if there is a confrontation that takes place between the United States and Russia again. It is the nations in the middle in Eastern Europe that are going to get the squeeze. That is where it is going to be fought. Those are the people who are going to suffer. . . .

Wall Street Journal

April 29, 1998

Pg. 17

Indonesian Students Ask if Military Is Ally

Debate Over How to Oust Suharto Could Decide Outcome of Movement

By PETER WALDMAN

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

YOGYAKARTA, Indonesia—Beneath the consensus among Indonesian university students that President Suharto must go, a debate is raging over how to drive the 76-year-old leader from office.

The outcome of the tactical dispute might determine if the student movement succeeds in transforming Indonesia's stultified political system or goes the way of past student campaigns against the Suharto regime, into oblivion.

The issue is whether the students should confront, or try to cajole, Indonesia's armed forces, which are under orders from Mr. Suharto to crack down hard on all political protesters outside campus walls.

The dilemma is played out daily at nearly every Indonesian university. Factions of more-radical students clamor to take the battle into the streets, while more-reserved students advocate a policy of co-operation and co-optation toward the troops waiting outside. The armed forces recently resorted to tear gas, rubber bullets, water cannons and mass detentions to keep protesters at bay, suggesting that the confrontational side is winning the day.

"The students can't agree," says Ahmad Fauzi, a philosophy student at Gadjah Mada University and a leader of a more-confrontational group. "We participate in each other's rallies, but there's no consensus on where to go from there."

The dissonance reflects a general confusion in Indonesian society about the role and identity of the armed forces. From Indonesia's war of independence in the 1940s through its decades of internal rebellions

in the 1960s and 1970s, the military was revered in Indonesia as the guardian of national unity. But its seamless weave into the 32-year-old Suharto regime—the president is a five-star general—has sullied its reputation.

More-confrontational students and others now eager to butt heads with the armed forces see them as the regime's hatchet men. Many other Indonesians, meanwhile, regard the military as the nation's only hope for salvation from the Suharto clan—an image promoted by the student activists' key faculty mentors. The influential professors, many of them student activists themselves in the 1960s and 1970s, know that no political reform has succeeded in Indonesia without the military's backing.

"The students who have learned from history understand that without the armed forces, they can't succeed," says Leo Suryadinata, an Indonesia expert at the National University of Singapore.

That was precisely the advice offered by political scientist Afan Gaffar when a group of student leaders called on his home last week. The Gadjah Mada University

professor, an outspoken critic of the government, says he warned his young proteges to beware of efforts, emanating from Jakarta, to sow discord between the students and the military. If the historical alliance between student activists and the armed forces is severed completely, he says, the student movement is finished.

Meanwhile, student activists and other Indonesians traffic in multiple contradictory theories about whether the military, in a pinch, can or can't be trusted to side with the people against the regime.

Military officers, too, are confused, Prof. Gaffar says.

"I strongly believe all the senior officers want to help Suharto finish his last job, fixing the economy," he says. "This puts them in a very difficult position: They share the students' desire for change, but they want to wait for the right time."

A Western diplomat in Jakarta says: "Generals are lying awake at night staring at the ceiling, worried that a misstep in handling protests could be disastrous."

—Raphael Pura in Jakarta contributed to this article.

Washington Times

April 29, 1998

Pg. 15

New Iranian deal signaled by Iraq

BAGHDAD — Iraq said yesterday it is prepared to renew acceptance of its border with Iran in return for Tehran dropping demands for compensation from their eight-year war that Baghdad started.

"Iraq is ready to renew the 1975 Algiers accord under which the two countries' border passes through the Thalweg, the deepest part of the Shatt al-Arab waterway, if Tehran gives up its claims to damages under U.N. Se-

curity Council Resolution 598," the weekly Iraqi newspaper Al-Shab said.

The paper, which is run by Uday Hussein, eldest son of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein, said Iraq and Iran "agree to continue their contacts on advancing the normalization process . . . especially after Tehran officially announces that it will give up war damages."

Resolution 598, adopted in 1987, ended the fighting, but despite the cease-fire, no peace treaty has been signed.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE

ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski

NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus

EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee

EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson

SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)